

JPRS-TAC-86-023

11 March 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

11 March 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

- Soviet Journal Reviews SIPRI Books on Arms Race in Outer Space
(I. Kuznetsova, Yu. Orlov; Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS,
No 12, Dec 85)..... 1

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

- USSR Official Evaluates Merits of Gorbachev Proposal
(Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 29 Jan 86)..... 7
- USSR's Primakov Analyzes Gorbachev Disarmament Proposal
(Ye. Primakov; Moscow PRAVDA, 22 Jan 86)..... 9
- USSR: Gorbachev Proposal Draws Positive Worldwide Response
(Moscow in Mandarin to China, 11 Feb 86)..... 13
- USSR Notes Continued Foreign Support for New Gorbachev Proposal
(Various sources, various dates)..... 15
- PRAVDA's Weekly Review 15
- Belgians 'Display Great Interest' 18
- Canada's Clark Welcomes Initiative 18
- WFTU Support 19
- Polish Government Supports Proposal 20
- Polish Sejm Issues Resolution 20
- PRAVDA Cites Jaruzelski 21
- More on Jaruzelski Support 22
- Czechoslovak Support 22
- Honecker on Arms Race, German Role 23
- SRV's Vo Nguyen Giap 23
- Indian Rally, Officials Praise Proposal 24
- Libya Supports Proposal
- Afghan Defense Minister Hails Proposal, Nazar Muhammed
Interview 25

Swedish Peace Committee	26
Belgian Socialists	27
Italian Communist Leader	27
Polish Foreign Minister's Statement, by M. Orzechowski	28
Czechoslovakia's Husak Statement	31
Bulgaria's Zhivkov Statement	31
CSSR Foreign Minister Chnoupek, by Bohuslav Chnoupek	32
GDR's Honecker	34
PRAVDA Cites Honecker Praise	35
Hungary Hails Soviet Program	35
 TASS: U.S. Stance on Verification 'Groundless' (Moscow TASS, 31 Jan 86).....	 36
 Moscow Views Moratorium, Verification Proposals (Moscow in English to North America, 10 Feb 86).....	 38
 Soviet Experts Explain Missile Withdrawal Proposals (Vienna Domestic Service, 12 Feb 86; Vienna Television Service, 12 Feb 86).....	 41
 Press Conference Reported	41
Portugalov's Statement on SS-20's, by Nikolay Portugalov	43
 PRAVDA Editorial Outlines Arms Initiatives (Moscow PRAVDA, 25 Jan 86).....	 44
 USSR's Arbatov Sees Chance for 'Normalization' of Relations (Georgiy Arkadyevich Arbatov Interview; Budapest Domestic Service, 10 Feb 86).....	 47
 Soviet Journal Reviews Gorbachev's Fall 1985 Visit to France (A. Vtorov; INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 12, Dec 85).....	 50

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS: U.S. Strategy Uses Europe as Nuclear Buffer (Moscow TASS International Service, 12 Feb 86).....	57
 Soviet Army Paper: 'European Aspect' Vital to Disarmament (F. Gontar; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 8 Feb 86).....	 59
 TASS: INF Accord Possible Without Space Arms Connection (Moscow TASS, 7 Feb 86).....	 62
 TASS: U.S. Officials 'Camouflage' 'Obstructionist Stand' (Moscow TASS, 15 Feb 86).....	 63
 SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA on FRG 'Reluctance' to Disarm (Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 4 Feb 86).....	 65

PRAVDA: Dutch Labor Party Votes Against Cruise Missiles (Moscow PRAVDA, 18 Feb 86).....	67
Soviet Envoys Outline Soviet Position on European Missiles (Stockholm Domestic Service, 12 Feb 86).....	68
USSR's Chervov, Mikhaylov Delineate Soviet Stands (Hamburg DPA, 11 Feb 86).....	69
Briefs	
TASS Notes Tomahawk Trial	70

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

Soviet Journal on Results of Fall 1985 CD Session (V. Levonov; Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 12, Dec 85).....	71
--	----

NUCLEAR TESTING-FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

Soviet Journal on Importance of NFZ in South Pacific (A. Kuznetsov; Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 12, Dec 85).....	78
---	----

RELATED ISSUES

Soviet Book on Confrontation Policy Reviewed (Yu. Chernyakov; Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 12, Dec 85).....	83
---	----

SOVIET JOURNAL REVIEWS SIPRI BOOKS ON ARMS RACE IN OUTER SPACE

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 12, Dec 85 pp 116-121

[Article by I. Kuznetsova and Yu. Orlov: "USA's Dangerous Undertakings in Outer Space"]

[Text]

For many years the Soviet Union has persistently explored ways of resolving the overriding question of today—halting the arms race, breaking the arms limitation deadlock, and effecting a turn to peaceful mutually beneficial cooperation. Of particular importance in our day is the prevention of the militarisation of outer space and of the deployment in it of strike space weapons whose appearance would inevitably undermine world stability and open up new canals for an unbridled nuclear arms race, strategic arms first and foremost. The USSR is demonstrating its goodwill and resolve to strengthen peace and security by its constructive initiatives, including such ones as its unilateral moratorium on the carrying of any types of antisatellite weapons into outer space as long as other states, the USA included, act similarly. In adopting such a commitment, the Soviet Union proceeded from the belief that the moratorium would promote a cessation of the arms race along all lines. However, as reality has shown, the United States has responded to these sincere manifestations of peaceability, to these specific and palpable steps taken by the USSR to prevent a world nuclear catastrophe, by testing its antisatellite systems, thus demonstrating its desire to step up preparations for "star wars".

What is Washington guided by in taking steps that run counter to the interests of humanity and to the demands of the world public at large? The answer to this question can be drawn to a certain extent from a book published last year by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute devoted to one of the crucial problems of our day—preventing the arms race from spreading to outer space.¹

Two books it put out previously—*Outer Space—Battlefield of the Future?* and *Outer Space — A New Dimension of the Arms Race* — were noteworthy for their abundance of factual material characterising the approach of the West, the USA first and foremost, to the militarisation of outer space, and for their deep analysis of the military, political and juridical aspects of the consequences of the shift of the arms race to a new—cosmic—dimension.

From the set of issues connected with the danger of the appearance and deployment of strike space weapons, the new book singles out one—the problem of antisatellite systems. This is no accident. The emplacement of US ASAT weapons clearly can accelerate the start of an arms

race in space. It is also a known fact that the development of strike antisatellite systems is one of the most important ways in which the USA can sidestep and actually violate the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty of 1972.

The book consists of a series of materials prepared by a large team of authors representing different countries, viewpoints, including the Soviet scholars Evgeny Velikhov, Andrei Kokoshin and Aleksei Vassiliev. The book opens with a preface by Bhupendra Jasani, the editor of collection, which claims to be an objective summary of all points of view. It should be said, however, that in a number of instances the author is

far from being objective, and at times his judgements add grist to the mill of those who are trying to prove the "rightfulness" of the implementation of the "star wars" programme from the point of view of the existing international agreements, and the spurious compatibility of plans to deploy strike space weapons with the purpose of consolidating strategic stability.

Touching upon the consequences of the appearance of combat antisatellite systems, the authors of the materials published in the book are perhaps unanimous in the belief that it cannot but evoke concern. It is indisputable that an antisatellite system (ASAT) is an offensive weapon designed for "blinding" an enemy and disorganising his warning, communications and tracking systems. The creation of possibilities for its wide-scale and sudden use—and it is from this standpoint that the US ASAT air-based system is being developed—will spell sharply increased instability of the overall strategic situation, and greater danger of an incorrect assessment of the actions and intentions of the other side, specifically, in case of any accidental malfunctioning of a satellite which, given the deployment of antisatellite systems, can easily be taken for a signal of hostile actions. It is also obvious that antisatellite technology is practically indivisible from other types of attack space weapons. The possession of antisatellite weapons would make it possible subsequently to create new, even more dangerous systems, including directed-energy multi-purpose weapons. After testing and deployment it would be much more difficult to prohibit and control antisatellite weapons than prior to this stage. The development of antisatellite weapons would most likely lead eventually, if the necessary measures are not taken, to the disintegration of the present system of international regulations dealing with limitations on military use of outer space, the breakdown of the 1972 ABM Treaty, and the disorganisation of the entire process of arms control.

In short, numerous dangers are visible even to the naked eye. Incidentally, they are also understood by the American authors of the collection, and not only by those who advocate a ban on antisatellite weapons (Kurt Gottfried from the Cornell University nuclear research laboratory), but also by apologists of the creation and deployment of attack space weapons. However, the latter urge staking all. Why?

The opinion on this score of such figures as Donald Kerr, Director of the Los Alamos National Laboratory, the ill-starred attack space weapons development centre, or Paul Nahin, representative of the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering of the University of New-Hampshire, is of interest, especially against the background of the pathetic explanations and excuses churned out by the US Administration, when it began in September 1985 testing of its ASAT system on a real target in outer space. Judging by their pronouncements, certain circles in the USA have again decided that they have an opportunity to shoot ahead in the arms race, attain military superiority through outer space, devalue the Soviet defence potential, and get a chance to blackmail the USSR militarily.

The following is the rather frank set of arguments which are being adduced to justify the course for deploying American antisatellite weaponry and the discarding all proposals to outlaw these weapons on a mutually acceptable basis.

Argument One. Possessing the ASAT system, the USA will dispose antisatellite weapons already of the second generation, while the USSR has only a first-generation system, and one which has not been fully tested, for that matter. American air-based weapons, equipped with the new MHV infra-red homing guided interceptor, provides a much greater

strike potential and can be used in a concentrated and surprise strike, i. e. it promises military gains.

One cannot but recall the hypocritical claims of the US Administration to the effect that Americans want only to "catch up" to the USSR, eliminated a "Soviet monopoly" on antisatellite weapons and set aright the present "imbalance". In reality, the USA launched the creation of antisatellite weapons in 1959, almost ten years earlier than the Soviet Union, and it did not stop for a day, developing a whole series of antisatellite systems. Nor did it wind up the project after the declaration by the Soviet side of a unilateral moratorium on the carrying of antisatellite systems into outer space. Nor did it accept the Soviet proposal on a ban on attack space-based weapons, including antisatellite systems, and on the destruction of such systems possessed by the sides. Such are the facts.

Argument Two. Antisatellite weapons are a possible means for undermining the capacity of the other side to deliver a retaliatory strike. "For second-strike retaliation, current strategic nuclear forces depend on early warning satellites for initial detection of ballistic missile launches," Kerr reasons. "Without this warning, insufficient time might be left to decide upon a response, execute an emergency action message, and launch vulnerable retaliatory forces before they are destroyed, or to move critical trans-attack command, control and communications facilities from exposed locations, so that they could transmit the action message to surviving forces.... Attack on early warning satellites could open the way for a reasonably effective surprise first strike against targetable nuclear weapon systems and command and control capabilities" (pp. 117-118).

These aggressive calculations are obvious and commentary is hardly necessary. The only problem, the American authors complain, is that the existing US systems would still not be capable for a number of technical reasons of fully performing the role assigned to them in this scenario. But this is only for the time being. Whence:

Argument Three. In the foreseeable future the USA hopes to possess antisatellite systems equipped with directed-energy weapons (laser and particle beams). Such antisatellite weaponry will possess a tremendous range of destruction and almost instantaneous action.

True, even the American hawks admit that this is a double-edged sword, and they are addressing themselves to the question of whether a ban should not be put on at least part of the antisatellite weapons, say, those which work at high altitudes where early-warning satellites are placed, and use the directed-energy weapons. However, here, too, the conclusion is drawn not in favour of an accord and limitation of antisatellite weapons. Why?

Argument Four. Evidently, prohibiting antisatellite systems would seriously hamper the continuation of the attack space weapons project. But precisely this does not suit the American side. True, now Washington is innocently assuring one and all that the ASAT design and testing project has nothing to do with the SDI programme. This is allegedly a

separate, special area. Only the truth lies elsewhere. In 1982 the US government informed Congress: "While high energy lasers and particle beams differ in state of development and in the technology required to realize them, they have potential for weapon systems of similar operational characteristics. Moreover, if they can be developed as weapons, they could have similar implications for the future of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, possible antisatellite (ASAT) negotiations, and space defense issues generally."²

And the aforementioned venerable expert Paul Nahin attests: "Any space-based DEW (directed-energy weapon) deployment suitable for ABM use would almost surely satisfy the technical requirements of an ASAT system. Therefore, banning ASAT DEWs would automatically ban ABM DEWs" (pp. 98-99).

The main reason why the USA does not want a ban on antisatellite weapons is that it would undermine the prospects for the implementation of the notorious SDI programme, i. e. the plans to shield from a retaliatory strike with space weapons. They do not want to prohibit them because under the banner of creating antisatellite systems not limited by international agreements, they are breaking down the ABM Treaty, wedging at all corners that they are advocating the "consolidation of the regime" of this Treaty. "Many potential ASAT technologies are being pursued actively as possible BMD candidates," Kerr admits. If the Treaty is exploded, the worse for the Treaty. It is unwise, Kerr cynically reasons, to be unlimitedly committed to the ABM Treaty (p. 108).

The most that could be agreed to, in his opinion, is a temporary ban on the production and deployment of antisatellite weapons. Then the "cutting out" of attack space weapons will show how to act later: if the venture to create space-based antisatellite systems brings Washington the desired gains, there should be no ban on antisatellite systems; if, however, the SDI proves untenable, then that is another matter. However, by all intents and purposes, in this case, too, the Americans are thinking not about how not to permit the deployment of antisatellite weapons but about how to emplace those types of them which are advantageous to the USA and prohibit those which the Washington strategists consider less advantageous.

Argument Five. The antisatellite systems targeted at high-altitude satellites, the US experts figure, could be prohibited, since it is no less dangerous for the United States to deprive itself of these early-warning satellites than for the Soviet Union, as this is the threshold of a large-scale nuclear war in which, as the US President was recently forced to admit, there can be no winners. Systems targeted on low-orbit satellites i. e. on so-called tactical satellites, are another matter. They believe that it would make sense for the USA to possess this antisatellite weaponry.

"Tactical satellites—electronic and photographic reconnaissance and ocean surveillance satellites—tend to be placed in low Earth orbits. Attack of these satellites would be most significant during a conventional war, or during a limited nuclear war.... Since conventional or limited nuclear wars are usually thought to be more likely than a nuclear 'bolt out of the blue', and current generation ASAT weapons are designed to operate in the regime where tactical support satellites are stationed, special attention might be given to the strategic and arms control aspects of low-altitude ASAT systems. It might be desirable to develop ASAT limitations to enforce a 'firebreak' between high- and low-altitude ASAT systems, and as far as possible between tactical and strategic ASAT" (pp. 118-119).

In this fashion, a quite concrete, ominous interconnection is beginning to show through between the ASAT system to which the US Administration is holding on so tightly, and the American first-strike missiles deployed in Western Europe, and between the "star wars" plans veiled behind a show of captivation with scientific and technological progress, and dreams about limiting nuclear wars.

When one has no desire to prohibit antisatellite weapons, one, of course, finds a wealth of arguments to prove that supposedly this task is unworkable altogether. Most of them revolve around the question of the verifiability of such a ban, i. e. around the problem of control. Supporters

of the "star wars" programme are going out of their way in order, under the guise of the necessity to ensure "150 per cent" control of all thinkable and unthinkable instances of violations or side-stepping of the ban on antisatellite systems, to impose the idea that the corresponding accord, even if it were achieved, would prove ineffective.

Of course, control over the prohibition of antisatellite systems is no easy job. And it is not at all becoming any easier because, contrary to the Soviet proposals not to test antisatellite weapons and not carry them into outer space, the USA doggedly continues the development of its corresponding antisatellite systems. However, effective control is possible if both sides show an understanding of the need for an accord and the political will to attain it. This is the conclusion drawn by many authoritative researchers on the question at hand—both American (Kurt Gottfried, Walter Slocombe), and West European (Sune Danielsson, Peter Jankowisch).

However, when people do not want to reach agreement, control becomes an end in itself. This is a well-known method, which the Americans have used on a number of occasions. They are also resorting to it in connection with the antisatellite weapons question. When they want to reach accord, they then show an understanding of the fact that control is designed to ensure a sufficient degree of confidence that the commitments adopted will be observed, and it did not and cannot have a self-sufficing meaning.

Some authors of the collection also take pains to create the impression that the American SDI programme supposedly does not in the least contradict the USA's commitments under the 1972 ABM Treaty, and that the Treaty can also be undermined directly, by creating a basis for wide-scale antimissile defence with space-based elements and, stealthily, by developing highly effective antisatellite weapons systems. Such a posing of the question, and even more, the completely open practical actions of the USA to undermine the ABM Treaty are exerting their impact, including on representatives of neutral states, who are beginning to search for the reasons for what is taking place in the "imperfection" of the wording of the Treaty, and to interpret it incorrectly instead of giving the illegal actions of the US Administration the proper juridical qualification.

Unfortunately, the same flaw is to be found in the editor of the collection, who advances strange judgements to the effect that the ABM Treaty supposedly permits the deployment of laser and other directed-energy weapons for antimissile defence purposes, and all the limitations it establishes only refer to a system consisting of antimissiles deployed in defined regions (p. 34).

Such an interpretation has nothing in common either with the spirit or the letter of the ABM Treaty. It fully ignores the key provision of the Treaty (Article 1 para. 2), which makes it incumbent on the sides not to deploy ABM systems for a defence of the territory of their countries and not to create a basis for such a defence. However, it is a known fact

that precisely this goal is pursued by the American SDI programme and the antimissile defence systems being created within its framework, which use directed-energy weapons. Mention should also be made of the fact that Article V of the Treaty directly obliges the sides not to develop, test or deploy AMB systems or their components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based or mobile land-based. And it is purposeful work to build such systems that is being done in the USA under the SDI programme. And it is being done not because the Treaty permits it, but because Washington in its pursuit of military superiority openly disregards its political and juridical commitments. While Jasani is exploring ways of "rendering compatible" the USA's actions in creating attack space weapons with the ABM Treaty, Washington is frankly stating that

at the appropriate moment it intends to push aside this Treaty, which is increasingly preventing it from implementing its ambitious plans.

An analysis of all the aspects of the antisatellite weapons problem will lead to one conclusion: that antisatellite weaponry should be banned. This was the conclusion that was drawn, albeit with many reservations by the editor, who advocates an accord between the USSR and the USA on the prohibition of testing and possessing of antisatellite weapons.

As is well known, the Soviet Union at the Geneva nuclear and space arms talks has consistently come out for a ban on the creation (including R&D), testing and deployment of attack space weapons. This ban should include antisatellite systems. Such systems already in existence should be eliminated.

The antisatellite weapons problem is an organic component of the attack space weapons problem. Its resolution would be a step forward in preventing the spread of the arms race to outer space. On the other hand, refusal to resolve it and the continuation of projects to build attack space weapons lead to a deadend street.

¹ *Space Weapons—The Arms Control Dilemma*, Ed. by Bhupendra Jasani, SIPRI, Taylor and Francis, London and Philadelphia, 1984.

² *Fiscal Year 1983 Arms Control Impact Statement, Statements Submitted to the Congress (U. S. Government Printing Office)*, Washington, 1982, p. 299.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Gnaniye", 1985

English Translation Progress Publishers 1985

/9317

CSO: 5200/1253

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR OFFICIAL EVALUATES MERITS OF GORBACHEV PROPOSAL

PM291623 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 29 Jan 86 First Edition p 1

[V. Petrovskiy comment under the rubric "Interview Via Teleprinter": "The Art of Finding a Common Language"--first three paragraphs are SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA introduction]

[Text] The following report has arrived at the editorial office:

Greek Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou has declared that "the USSR's new initiatives are some of the most positive steps that could be taken in the present situation."

We have asked Vladimir Federovich Petrovskiy, USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary and member of the USSR Foreign Affairs Ministry Collegium, to comment on this.

This report is not fortuitous. The disarmament plan put forward in the Statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has evoked a broad response in the world. Summing up all the proposals contained in this document, one could say that it defines the shortest routes to, and specifies very precise landmarks for moving in the direction of, limitation in the most dangerous spheres of the arms race. The statement is not just a declaration. It contains a realistic platform for specific and resolute action.

The essence of the Soviet approach to international problems is the following: Security is now created by political rather than military means. Yet this can be achieved only by means of talks. And I would like to particularly emphasize -- fruitful talks.

It is often argued in the West that diplomatic talks are an art. This is beyond question, of course. But when the reasoning begins to resemble the concept of "art for art's sake," or in the language of diplomats "talks for talks' sake," then we resolutely reject it. Today it is important not just to set the whole system of bilateral and multilateral talks in motion, but, most importantly, to ensure that they yield as much as possible.

No matter what question concerning international relations we focus on, it can be settled only by means of dialogue. Take for example the problem of delivering mankind for nuclear weapons. The questions that could be tackled during the first stage of nuclear disarmament as set out in the statement fit organically within the range of problems that are currently being discussed in Geneva at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms which have resumed.

Dialogue is also needed to end all nuclear tests and thus to block this channel of improving nuclear weapons. While appealing to the United States to join the moratorium on all nuclear explosions which we have declared unilaterally, we also favor the resumption of the tripartite talks (between the USSR, the United States, and Britain) on a general and complete nuclear weapons test ban. We are also prepared, within the framework of the Geneva Disarmament Conference which resumes its work 4 February, to open multilateral talks with the participation of all nuclear powers on banning nuclear tests. We support the nonaligned countries' proposal to hold consultations with a view to extending the 1963 Moscow treaty to include underground tests.

We are in favor of sharply increasing the yield of the Vienna talks whose next round begins on 30 January. In Vienna, as is well known, a no less important task, the reduction of conventional arms and armed forces in central Europe, is being discussed.

Now let us turn to the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe which has resumed its work. Here, too, we have put forward a number of far-reaching, constructive proposals which make it possible to rapidly eliminate obstacles that have long been blocking progress there.

The questions that are being discussed in Vienna, Stockholm, and Geneva are, in one way or another, connected with the problem of verification. We are in favor of specific verification measures forming an integral part of every accord on arms limitation and disarmament.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1262

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR'S PRIMAKOV ANALYZES GORBACHEV DISARMAMENT PROPOSAL

PM231250 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[Article by Academician Ye. Primakov: "Way to the Future"]

[Text] Last week the Soviet Union put forward large-scale multifaceted peace initiatives. They are set out in the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Basically, it is a program to eliminate the threat of an all-destructive war.

The historical period in which mankind is living is characterized by an exceptionally serious threat of war looming over the world and, at the same time, by a more realistic possibility than ever before of eliminating this threat.

By the middle of the eighties the departure from the policy of reducing international tension had reached its peak. Through the fault of reactionary imperialist circles, primarily the United States, the world had moved very close to the point which, if crossed, would threaten the total annihilation of human civilization. What is more, even drawing near this point is fraught with great danger -- a further increase in the tension in relations between the USSR and the United States could create an uncontrollable situation, chaos in international relations and, ultimately, make the threat of their universal destabilization irreversible.

The April (1985) CPSU Central Committee Plenum adopted a course aimed at speeding up the country's socioeconomic development and effecting a resolute turnaround in the most diverse spheres of social relations.

Naturally, the implementation of this course required a stable international situation and new efforts to halt the arms race. Our party has always worked to create an international climate most favorable to socialist and communist building. This time, however, it is a question of a particularly pressing necessity emanating both from the scale of the tasks set by the plenum and from the logic of developing the "external environment" in which these tasks must be resolved.

Indeed, never before has the necessity for a turnaround toward the normalization of international relations been so urgent. Never before has the question arisen so sharply of the necessity for state figures to realistically evaluate the danger of the processes taking place in international life, the necessity to establish a new kind of political thinking in the practice of international life.

During the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, noted a number of the principled features of the kind of political thinking demanded by present-day realities.

First, understanding is required of the dialectical connection between the division of the world into two parts -- socialist and capitalist -- developing according to their own laws and the continuing unity of the world. This unity is reflected not only in the definite interdependence of the two systems' states in the economic sphere and not only in their objective interest in resolving tasks common to all mankind -- environmental protection, the search for fundamentally new energy sources, the struggle against hunger and disease, and so forth. This unity is not mainly reflected in the fact that, fact to face with the threat of a thermonuclear catastrophe, mankind has realized: The problem of its survival has arisen.

Back at the dawn of the first socialist state's existence V.I. Lenin spoke of the priority of the interests of social development. It was he who drew the conclusion about the continuing world economy and about the possibility and necessity of peaceful coexistence between the socialist state and capitalist states, which includes as an important element their constructive cooperation in various spheres. Given the existence of the present mass destruction weapons and the threat of a nuclear missile war, and in conditions where mankind's survival and civilization's further progress depend on the joint efforts of states with different social systems within the framework of a dual world, the Leninist theory of peaceful coexistence acquires very great significance.

Second, the nature of politicians' new way of thinking must incorporate the necessity to recognize the existence of different countries' objective interests, to seek areas where these interests coincide, and to then act with the aim of bringing them closer together. From this stems the obligation to observe measures guaranteeing the mutual security of the two largest nuclear powers -- the Soviet Union and the United States -- and that of the Warsaw Pact states and the NATO countries, on which general world security also largely depends. The military and strategic parity between the USSR and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact and NATO is such an instrument. The Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that the existing parity in the arms level must be consistently lowered while preserving the sides' equal security at all stages without fail.

The appeal to the United States to renounce its representation of the Soviet Union's interests as being totally at variance with the interests of the United States follows from this clear idea of the mechanism of maintaining mutual security. Of course, the contradictory nature of the interests of the two powers acting as the leaders of opposite systems cannot be either ignored or passed over in silence. Nevertheless, there is one sphere where this contradictoriness and even this state of opposition cannot be raised to the absolute. This is the sphere of security. Under present conditions, the weakening of one side's security runs counter to the interests of the other. By arousing suspicion in it and urging it in the direction of a further acceleration of the arms race, it can lead to the creation of an even more unstable situation.

Relying on this realistic interpretation of the correlation of Soviet and U.S. interests, it is not difficult to foresee which decisions are capable of leading to an increase in international tension. Just such a ruinous decision would be U.S. implementation of the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" or, to be more precise, preparation for "star wars," which would remove the last obstacles from the path of an unrestrained and uncontrolled arms race.

Third, an important element of the new type of political thinking is the necessity to cease viewing events taking place in the world through the prism of U.S.-Soviet confrontation. When a revolutionary situation arises in the course of the historical process in one country or another and the people assume power, this has nothing in common with the mythical "activity of Moscow," which supposedly plants anti-U.S. regimes.

It should also be noted that revolutionary governments are not inclined against Washington automatically -- this is their reaction to U.S. support for counterrevolution.

Nicaragua serves as a convincing example. Any unbiased observer reaches the conclusion that the Sandinist government assumed power as a result of a popular revolution and that it enjoys the support of the majority of the country's population.

Despite this, the United States has begun an undeclared war against Nicaragua guided by false logic: Everything that does not submit to U.S. diktat is directed against U.S. interests and is a component part of U.S. confrontation with the USSR. By building up tension, this approach -- which relates not only to Nicaragua, but also to the situation around Afghanistan and events in the Near East and southern Africa -- could become the detonator of new and powerful explosions, whose pernicious consequences go far beyond the bounds of "local conflicts."

On the other hand, realistic appraisal of the real causes of various regional conflicts is important for joint or parallel measures to be taken by the two powers aimed at creating favorable conditions for the purpose of settling these conflicts.

Creating an atmosphere of mutual trust between the Soviet Union and the United States is of great significance for untying international knots. Soviet-U.S. summit meetings are expected to play an important role here. The "moments of truth" which arise with such meetings create a potential whose realization will provide considerable incentive for progress to be made in the cause of peace and international security. All the indications are that the next meeting between the top USSR and U.S. leadership will be held this year. The time left before it must be filled with actions which would begin to establish a new kind of political thinking.

Specific ways of realizing a new type of political thinking are defined in the statement by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary. It advances proposals for truly major, large-scale foreign policy actions aimed at cardinally improving the entire international situation and safeguarding peace in the 21st century.

These proposals form an integral complex. It is primarily a question of eliminating mass destruction means. The most significant measure in this sphere in terms of its importance is the program for the total elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the world. These proposals also formulate the task of totally eliminating another barbaric type of weapon -- chemical weapons. It is also proposed that agreement be reached on also banning all non-nuclear means of waging war which, by virtue of their strike capacity, approximate the characteristics of mass destruction weapons. A system of measures to reduce conventional arms and armed forces is simultaneously proposed. It goes without saying that all the measures must be accompanied by a pledge not to create, test, or deploy space-based strike weapons.

Never in the past has any state come forward with such a broad and detailed multifaceted set of proposals whose implementation would virtually close all doors to the arms race. Also for the first time in history, not only are the aims proclaimed, but the time frame for their phased achievement is also defined, which is particularly important in relation to the total elimination of nuclear weapons -- it is planned to do this in three stages over the course of the 15 years remaining until the end of this century.

The USSR's proposals are specific, constructive, and realistic. They take into account the security interests of the USSR, the United States, and also other states, nuclear and non-nuclear.

They take into account the broad range of different opinions and arguments voiced by statesmen and public movements of various political hues. Responding to the appeal of peace-loving organizations in the West and striving to use every possibility to influence the position of the United States, the Soviet Union has, for example, taken the none too simple [ne prostoye dlya sebya] decision to extend for another 3 months its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions.

The sum of the proposals put forward in the statement of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary politically and morally disarm those who, by falsifying reality, have tried to discredit the USSR in the eyes of world public opinion and to thereby justify the U.S. course of an arms race coupled with its transfer into space.

Of particular significance in this respect is the USSR's detailed [razvernuty] position on the question of verification. The statement clearly says that, in the event of a specific accord on questions of arms reduction, the Soviet Union, being no less interested in verification than the United States, is prepared to establish the most effective forms of verification.

As is well known, the United States has tried in the past to instill in the public the idea of the Soviet Union's "closed nature," which supposedly makes verification of agreements on disarmament problems impossible. There were no grounds for such speculation earlier. Now it is essentially impossible. How can one justify to public opinion, for example, the U.S. refusal to follow the USSR and declare a moratorium on nuclear explosions, when the Soviet Union is also prepared for international forms of verification and for on-site inspection? Or how can one justify the negative U.S. approach to the proposal to eliminate industrial capacities for the manufacture of chemical weapons and stockpiles of these weapons when the USSR is prepared, on a mutual basis, to declare the locations of its enterprises which produce these weapons and to establish reliable verification both of the destruction of these weapons and of the dismantling of these enterprises, including international on-site verification in this case also? The same question can also be raised with regard to verification of the elimination of medium-range missiles and verification of observance of the ban on space-based strike weapons to the point of opening up the corresponding laboratories for inspection.

By including a program for the elimination of nuclear weapons, the Soviet proposals knock the ground from beneath the feet of those who, contrary to common sense, intend to carry out preparations for "star wars." In publicizing SDI Washington has tried to present the matter in such a way as to make it seem that rendering nuclear weapons unnecessary is all but its main aim. Instead of creating [sozdaniye] new and extremely dangerous weapons in space, the Soviet Union has proposed eliminating nuclear weapons themselves. Thus, it is proposed to begin the realization of new political approaches to international affairs. The Soviet Union, as its new peace initiatives show, is intensively traveling its part of the way. Now it is up to the United States.

/8309

CSO: 5 200/1262

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR: GORBACHEV PROPOSAL DRAWS POSITIVE WORLDWIDE RESPONSE

OW120434 Moscow in Mandarin to China 1600 GMT 11 Feb 86

[Excerpts] The proposal put forward by Comrade Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his 15 January statement on destroying all nuclear and chemical weapons by the year 2000, has drawn positive responses from all over the world. Our reporter on international issues, Volskiy, comments in this connection as follows:

The great interest aroused by the Soviet peace-loving proposal is only natural, because, as far as mankind is concerned, there is no task more pressing than this one, aimed at preventing a nuclear war.

In an interview with L'HUMANITE, Comrade Gorbachev emphatically pointed out: The Soviet Union works hard to destroy all nuclear weapons on earth and promote socialism, concerns itself with the future of mankind, and believes in developing the potential of mankind in inspiring creation, promoting humanitarianism, and making progress.

The new Soviet proposal put forward in the 15 January statement by Comrade Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has fully reflected this principled line of the CPSU and the Soviet Union.

It is known to all that it was the United States which used the mass-killing atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in Asia. According to documents from the Pentagon and other U.S. military bases, the United States, in the postwar years, has more than once seriously discussed the issue of using atomic bombs in Asia in the Korean war, and during the 1958 Taiwan Strait crisis. Later, when the United States committed aggression against Vietnam, it also planned to use atomic bombs. China has always been included in the list of targets for U.S. nuclear attack, whenever the United States tries to work out this list. This is nothing accidental.

From the very beginning, U.S. imperialism has regarded the Chinese revolution as its enemy -- a ferocious and cruel enemy. The United States has practically regarded the Chinese territory of Taiwan, which it had illegally occupied, as its principal base to launch its crusade expedition against China. What merits attention is the fact that Washington is even more stubbornly hindering the return of Taiwan to the embrace of the motherland by continually supplying modern weapons to the pro-U.S. Taipei regime. It is obvious that this is a component part of its general line in strengthening and expanding its military bases, including nuclear bases, in Asia in the vicinity of China.

All these U.S. activities are of no use. The imperialist clique, aggressive by nature, is basically unwilling to coexist in peace with socialism. Under this situation, Comrade Gorbachev's proposal will help mankind eliminate all nuclear and chemical weapons by the year 2000. Willing to restrict or ban weapons of all types, the Soviet Union is concerned over the most pressing and fundamental need of the people of various countries and all mankind. The people of various countries can, and should, contribute to doing everything in accordance with the desire of mankind and the people of all countries on earth. Those people naturally include the Chinese, who would bear the brunt of the arms race initiated by the imperialists.

/8309

CS9: 5200/1262

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR NOTES CONTINUED FOREIGN SUPPORT FOR NEW GORBACHEV PROPOSAL

PRAVDA's Weekly Review

PM301149 Moscow PRAVDA /n Russian 26 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[Boris Katov "International Review"]

[Excerpt] A Powerful Factor

The 10 days since CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's 15 January statement is a short time. But it is time enough to draw a definite conclusion that the whole world regards the USSR's major peace initiatives as a phenomenon of historic significance. For the first time in the history of the nuclear age a detailed, concrete, realistic, and therefore feasible program has been put forward, with a precise timetable for the complete and universal elimination of nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction.

The scale of the discussion of the Soviet initiatives, currently being conducted everywhere, is extraordinarily wide. There is probably no state in the world today whose public, whose official and broadest political circles have not shown keen interest in our plan. Of course, the range of assessment is quite wide, but the prevailing feeling is one of hope, satisfaction, approval, and support for the USSR's bold step.

The following will give the most concise picture of the most important and characteristic official international reaction.

Indian Prime Minister R. Gandhi: The CPSU Central Committee general secretary's statement is a great inspiration. We wholeheartedly congratulate him and hope that the other side's reply will be as positive. The program put forward by the Soviet Union is an alternative to nuclear arms in space. The document points the way to ridding the earth of nuclear weapons.

Swedish Prime Minister O. Palme: The Soviet Union has shown that it is seeing concrete results in disarmament and wants to rid Europe of nuclear weapons. We also welcome the USSR's decision to extend the moratorium on all nuclear explosions.

Argentine President R. Alfonsín: The USSR's new peace initiative is a positive step. It offers new opportunities for stepping up the struggle for peace worldwide. Socorro Díaz, chairman of Mexico's ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party ideological commission: The USSR's positions on the problem of maintaining world peace give all the peoples hope that the struggle against a nuclear conflagration will succeed. Australian Foreign Minister W. Hayden: M.S. Gorbachev's plan, envisaging complete nuclear disarmament by the end of the century, is of immense interest to Australia and will be carefully studied. Australia welcomes the Soviet Union's extension of the moratorium on nuclear tests.

Equally indicative is the reaction of NATO states' official circles, especially as Washington, according to *LE QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS*, was quick to warn them against "public pronouncements on the USSR proposals."

Greek Prime Minister A. Papandréou said that "the USSR's bold and original proposals aimed at protecting life on our planet are a concrete plan for the elimination of all types of mass destruction weapons." The Italian Foreign Ministry expressed the view that the USSR's proposals contain interesting new elements concerning, in particular, the problem of verification and reduction of medium-range missiles. The Dutch Foreign Ministry published a statement which said: The government takes a positive view of the USSR's proposals on the elimination of nuclear weapons on our planet by the year 2000. Norwegian Foreign Minister Sverre Strøm spoke positively of the Soviet initiatives.

According to an official statement from Madrid, "Spain, which made a free and sovereign decision to renounce both production and deployment of nuclear weapons on its territory, shares the aims of the USSR proposals." The French Government, the French External Relations Ministry said, notes that the USSR action program is based on the premise that the current U.S. -USSR talks will proceed much more quickly than over the past 15 years. France has already repeatedly emphasized that it wants to see concrete results within the context of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva. According to the British Foreign Office, the Soviet proposals "are extensive and contain new elements."

In past days FRG Foreign Minister H. -D. Genscher has made several public pronouncements on the USSR initiatives. According to him, the Soviet proposals contain constructive elements. The West would do well to analyze them in detail and give a constructive reply. "The spirit of Geneva," Genscher noted, "must not be a short-lived phenomenon. The signs of goodwill displayed in Geneva must not only be utilized but must be reinforced with confidence-building measures."

What about on the other side of the Atlantic? To what extent are they taking into account the realities of the modern world, in particular, the not insignificant fact that on this occasion even "Washington's partners in the NATO alliance," according to the West German magazine *DER SPIEGEL*, "are insisting that the Americans meet Moscow halfway"? Obviously the U.S. leaders are in no hurry to take that step. Clearly, the inertia of habitual attitudes is still great. After the first promising reaction from President Reagan, the White House incumbent plunged into eloquent silence on the issue.

However, his assistants and associates were not idle. There was a plethora of reservations, excuses, and "clarifications." It looks like the U.S. Administration is not yet prepared to act from realistic positions which would really permit an acceleration of the process of reaching accords in the disarmament sphere. The administration's reluctance to abandon the space militarization program and stop testing nuclear weapons remains the chief obstacle on this path. It is symptomatic that in the course of the session of the U.S. Congress which opened this week, which is to approve the state budget, the White House firmly intends, according to the U.S. press, to secure full appropriations for the "star wars" program by reducing, in a situation where there is an immense budget deficit, expenditure on other items, mainly civil needs.

After a period of confusion and perplexity all the "hawks," servants of the military industrial complex, operating both inside and outside the Washington administration, have regained their composure and have become very active. The other day Assistant Secretary of Defense R. Perle followed the example of his boss, C. Weinberger, and made a brazen attempt to justify the "star wars" program. He made an appeal in the press for the accelerated militarization of space, stating that this "will make peace more stable" and make it possible to "reduce nuclear arms levels." P. Buchanan, one of the President's assistants, has been publicly advocating continuation of the course toward confrontation with USSR.

The Canadian newspaper (SOUTHERN NEWS) was looking into its crystal ball when it wrote: "The Soviet proposals are bound to be branded impracticable by the 'hawks' in Reagan's administration who will not trust the Russians under any circumstances. But in the rest of the world the USSR's steps will obviously be received in quite a different way.

As we have seen, this is the case. Not only in the rest of the world, but in the United States too. The USSR's initiatives have met with understanding among broad political, business, and public circles who are worried by visions of a nuclear apocalypse.

For example, D. Rockefeller, a major spokesman for the banking world, said last Wednesday: "The USSR's proposal on the destruction of nuclear weapons on earth by the end of the century merits the closest attention and serious treatment." It would be possible to cite a whole series of statements by senators and representatives, urging careful study of the Soviet proposals in view of the fact that it is vital for both sides to have Soviet-U.S. accords on problems of limiting the arms race as soon as possible. Of course it will be very hard for the White House to disregard this. As the U.S. TIME magazine said in its 27 January issue: "At present Washington is feverishly seeking an effective method of responding to the 'Soviet grand plan.'

One thing is clear: the time for verbal assurances of love of peace has past. Specific action is needed, along with a clear and constructive response to the Soviet proposals, as urged by the world public. The Soviet program for general nuclear disarmament is a powerful factor of world politics.

Belgians 'Display Great Interest'

LD311535 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1140 GMT 31 Jan 86

[Text] Brussels, 31 Jan (TASS) -- Sergey Nikitin, the USSR ambassador in Belgium, and Anatoloy Slyusar, a special representative of the USSR Foreign Ministry, who has gone to Brussels to explain the points of the statement made by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on 15 January, 1986, have held talks at the Belgian Foreign Ministry. The Belgian side displayed great interest in the proposals put forward in the statement on the total and universal elimination of nuclear weapons and on other aspects of disarmament and improving the international climate.

Meetings also took place with Edward Leemans, president of the Senate of the Belgian Parliament; Frank Swaelen, chairman of the Christian Social Party; Guy Spitaels, chairman of the Socialist Party (Francophones); Louis van Geyt, chairman of the Belgian Communist Party; and also with Louis Tobback, chairman of the parliamentary faction of the Socialist Party (Flemish).

Canada's Clark Welcomes Initiative

LD241353 Moscow TASS in English 1019 GMT 24 Jan 86

[Text] Ottawa January 24 TASS -- "We welcome the broad-ranging proposal issued last week by General Secretary Gorbachev and its re-affirmation of the Soviet Union's commitment to nuclear disarmament," said Joseph Clark, Canada's external relations minister, speaking in the Parliament Thursday.

In a statement containing an official summary of the Canadian Government's attitude to the Soviet-American talks at Geneva on nuclear and space weapons, the minister pointed out that the new Soviet initiative warrants "very serious consideration." In his opinion, "the Geneva summit and the decision to regularize this high-level contact improve the prospects for progress in arms control."

Joseph Clark said that "Canada will actively encourage the conduct of serious and constructive negotiations" on disarmament. He pointed out in particular that the Canadian Government encourages "compliance with existing treaties."

"To deviate from a policy of full compliance," the minister stressed, "is to threaten the credibility and hence the viability of arms control. Canada firmly supports the regime created by the ABM treaty and the existing SALT agreements on limiting strategic forces. Our stance towards SDI research is rooted in the need to conform strictly with the provisions of the ABM treaty. We will continue to urge the parties to these treaties to do nothing to undermine their integrity, but rather work to reinforce their status and authority." He pointed out that the prospects of progress on arms control are clearly linked to an improvement in the general East-West relationship. The external relations minister stressed that "Confidence can be gradually generated through political actions that promote East-West consultation and cooperation." In that connection he stressed the significance of an "enhancement of the political dialogue with the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe."

WFTU Support

LD182125 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 18 Jan 86

[Text] WFTU stresses that the Soviet peace proposals put forward in the statement of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, provide for the most comprehensive and realistic measures, directed toward the complete elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000.

An opportunity for defending peace has arisen for mankind. This opportunity must not be lost, the WFTU states. Here is a latest news commentary; political observer Nikolay Shishlin is at the microphone:

It can be said already that the statement made by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev -- in which a new Soviet comprehensive plan for the establishment of peace, a realistic breakthrough toward disarmament, and the liberation of mankind from nuclear weapons is set out -- has been heard. It has been read through -- correctly, on the whole -- and it has been heard both in the United States and in other Western countries. It is natural that this statement is warmly supported by the socialist countries. It has been met with complete understanding by the Nonaligned Movement, by the developing states, and, of course, the broadest public circles heard it, who are interested in the consolidation of peace, in a radical improvement in the world political climate. And this wide address of the statement, the wide response to the statement is, of course, precious because basically this is a problem which is vitally important for the whole of mankind.

The problems and questions which were set out in the statement, those ideas which are put forward in the statement, can and must be resolved not only and not so much within the framework of Soviet-U.S. relations, as within the framework of the development of international relations as such. In this connection I would like to say that the year 1986, of course, began with great promise. Not only has loyalty to the spirit of Geneva been confirmed by the Soviet Union, but a concrete and constructive platform has been put forward, a combination of the efforts of all states and peoples, in the name of freeing the world from the burden of nuclear and chemical weapons. A broad program has been put forward so that space should remain peaceful and the earth should be peaceful too.

At issue here is the creation of essential international conditions for the favorable development of the whole of the international community. It seems to me symbolic that, having put forward extensive, constructive plans, connected with the coming work of the 27th CPSU Congress, our country is putting forward a bold and really audacious plan for establishing an enduring, stable peace on earth.

Polish Government Supports Proposal

LD250501 Moscow TASS in English 2304 GMT 24 Jan 86

[Text] Warsaw, January 24 TASS -- A report on the meeting of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic, which was released here today, says that the Government of the Polish People's Republic expresses full support for the new proposals on disarmament put forward by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev. This initiative of immense importance indicates a real way towards improvement of the international situation.

The Council of Ministers pointed out that relying on the invariable fundamental principles in foreign affairs, formulated in the Polish Constitution, Poland will continue its efforts in the interests of safeguarding peace, enhancing security and promoting international cooperation.

The Polish People's Republic will keep deepening and developing all-round relations with the Soviet Union and other states of the socialist community, and also extend mutually beneficial cooperation with the developing countries and strive for full normalization of relations with the capitalist states on the basis of sovereign equality and non-intervention in the internal affairs.

At the meeting it was pointed out that although complex situation persists in the world, there are prerequisites for its positive development in 1986. These prerequisites are created by the consistent peaceful policy of the socialist states, the report says.

Polish Sejm Issues Resolution

LD302241 Moscow TASS in English 1945 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Text] Warsaw, January 30 TASS -- The Sejm (Parliament) of the Polish People's Republic welcomes the programme of totally liquidating nuclear and chemical arms by the year 2000, outlined in the statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev. This is said in a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Polish Parliament and published here today.

Having studied questions of the international situation and the main tasks of Poland's foreign policy, the Sejm stressed the historic importance of the Soviet proposals and fully supported them. The resolution voices profound hope that this important Soviet action will herald a new landmark in international efforts to achieve nuclear detente, safeguard peace and jointly solve the problems of our time. The Polish Sejm shares the alarm of broad sections of the world public over the activity of the West's military-industrial complexes which want a further development of nuclear and conventional armaments and an extension of the arms race into outer space. The implementation of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" is fraught with a destabilisation of international relations and the beginning of a new stage in the arms race, it is said in the resolution of the Sejm of the Polish People's Republic.

PRAVDA Cites Jaruzelski

PM051125 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "At the PZPR Central Committee Plenum: Party Tasks Decreased"]

[Text] Warsaw, 3 Feb -- W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, stressed in his speech to the PZPR Central Committee plenum here the exceptional importance of the Soviet Union's proposals to eliminate nuclear weapons worldwide by the end of the present century.

The bold program put forward in the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, lays down a not easy but wholly realistic way to deliver mankind from the threat of nuclear catastrophe, which is based on conscientious observance of the criterion of mutual security. It creates extensive opportunities for using the gigantic potential and enormous resources allocated to armaments for the good of peace. We fully support this major, historic initiative, which once again confirms that socialism, peace, and progress are inseparable, the Polish leader said.

This is the source of our optimism when we think about the younger generation. We base all our plans for the future and all our strategy for educating the rising generation on the principle of lasting peace in Europe and throughout the world. However it should not be thought that peace, which has now lasted for 4 decades, is guaranteed once and for all. Peace is an asset which we must create and defend. This is the spirit in which we are raising our young people. Every condition conducive to this has been created under socialism.

In recent years, the speaker noted, much has been done to strengthen People's Poland as a durable link in the socialist community, enhance its defense capability, consolidate the alliance with fraternal countries, and forestall imperialist plans to destabilize the situation inside Poland. We have entered the UN-sponsored International Year of Peace with our heads held high and with a sense of duty well-performed.

Dwelling on the party's task of improving the educational system in Poland, which we discussed at the plenum, W. Jaruzelski noted the patriotism, education, and fostering of an active life stance play an important part in young people's ideological tempering. The perception that socialism is a powerful factor in further developing People's Poland must be the common denominator of the aims and methods of education.

More on Jaruzelski Support

LD041958 Moscow TASS in English 1919 GMT 4 Feb 86

[Text] Warsaw, February 4 TASS -- "The statement by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, outlining concrete ways of carrying out a comprehensive programme of disarmament and liquidating nuclear and chemical arms already before the end of the present century, is of historic importance". This was noted in his remarks by the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party, Chairman of the State Council of the Polish People's Republic Wojciech Jaruzelski. He received here today members of the Presidium of the Polish committee for conducting the congress of scientists and cultural figures in defence of the planet's peaceful future, held recently in the Polish capital.

"The new Soviet proposals set forth in the statement by the CPSU leader are directed at expanding dialogue on pressing problems facing the world", Wojciech Jaruzelski went on. He stressed that representatives of world science and culture should make their contribution to the struggle against the war danger.

"Mikhail Gorbachev's statement has become an event of paramount importance that influenced the atmosphere and course of the Warsaw congress", the Polish leader went on. He noted the big international importance of this forum which became one of the first events of the unproclaimed international year of peace. The congress offered its rostrum for an extensive dialogue between prominent representatives of science, culture and art, of public organisations coming out for peace and disarmament, for expanding international cooperation.

Czechoslovak Support

LD051724 Moscow TASS in English 1506 GMT 5 Feb 86

[Text] Prague, February 5 TASS -- The Czechoslovak people lives by the hope that resolute steps to prevent nuclear threat will be taken during the International Peace Year, stresses the document which was adopted at the joint meeting of the foreign affairs commissions of the House of the People and the House of Nations of the Federal Assembly of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, which has opened here.

The ways to attaining the goal have been indicated in the statement of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev. For the first time ever mankind was proposed a concrete plan of stage-by-stage elimination of weapons of mass destruction.

That plan can and must be put into life in a historically brief period of time so that the people yet in the 20th century should use atomic energy exclusively for peaceful purposes. The package of Soviet initiatives presupposes that the world will also be delivered from other weapons of mass destruction. The Czechoslovak people welcomes and supports the Soviet proposals.

The foreign affairs commissions of the Federal Assembly of Czechoslovakia express the hope that a headway would be attained at the Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva on the way towards an end to the arms race on earth and its prevention in outer space, towards creation of an atmosphere of confidence and mutual understanding.

Honecker on Arms Race, German Role

LD302139 Moscow TASS in English 2018 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Text] Berlin, January 30 TASS -- The German Democratic Republic wholly backs Mikhail Gorbachev's programme of ridding the world of nuclear arms by the year 2000, and regards it as a historic chance, Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of German and chairman of the State Council of the GDR, has stressed in an interview with the West German newspaper ZEIT.

The leader of the GDR pointed out that the new package of Soviet peace initiatives reaffirmed the USSR's resolve to advance towards stronger peace. The Geneva summit meeting and its results are of great importance for all of mankind. It created favourable conditions for preventing a nuclear disaster, ending the arms race on earth and keeping it out of space.

On the U.S. "Strategic Defence Initiative", Honecker pointed out that this programme enhances the risk of nuclear holocaust. The U.S. persistent desire to go ahead with the implementation of the space arms plans hinders already now progress at the disarmament talks.

The concentration of death-dealing weapons is nowhere as great as in Central Europe. This means for both German states that any military confrontation with the use of conventional or nuclear weapons would have devastating consequences.

Speaking on the special responsibility of the two German states for the destinies of peace, Honecker said that the two most terrible wars in the history of civilization started on German soil.

A third world war, a nuclear catastrophe would mean the self-destruction of mankind. "We believe," said the leader of the GDR, "that at present, when the 'star wars' programme of the United States is pushing the peoples towards a nuclear abyss, both German states should press for compliance with the existing arms control agreements and refrain, for their part, from any actions that might generate another round in the arms race."

SRV's Vo Nguyen Giap

LD271319 Moscow TASS in English 1207 GMT 27 Jan 86

[Text] Hanoi January 27 TASS -- Vo Nguyen Giap, a member of the Central Committee of the Vietnamese Communist Party, vice president of the Council of Ministers of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (SRV) and prominent Vietnamese military leader, has described the proposals for the complete elimination of nuclear and chemical weapons on the globe, advanced by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, as a "great document of peace".

In conditions when preserving peace and life on earth is a task of highest priority to mankind today, the statement by the Soviet leader demonstrates the U.S.S.R.'s unfaltering striving and readiness to start translating into life the peoples' aspirations, Vo Nguyen Giap told TASS correspondent Mikhail Kalmykov. The concrete stages in

nuclear disarmament and the terms set for this process, formulated in the comprehensive programme, are realistic and open up good prospects for progress in the cause of removing the threat of nuclear conflicts, the Vietnamese leader said.

The move to extend the Soviet moratorium on any nuclear blasts is evidence of the U.S.S.R.'s political will and high responsibility for the destiny of peace. Washington's words, however, have failed as yet to match its deeds, the "Strategic Defence Initiative" programme, touted by the U.S. Administration, constitutes in fact a dangerous offensive weapon rather than a shield, and is designed to extend the arms race into outer space. The peoples across the world demand that the United States follow the example of the U.S.S.R. and ultimately take a constructive stand on issues of achieving disarmament and preventing militarization of space.

The new proposals by Mikhail Gorbachev won the broadest and most ardent approval in Vietnam, Vo Nguyen Giap emphasized.

Indian Rally, Officials Praise Proposal

LD010848 Moscow TASS in English 0826 GMT 1 Feb 86

[Text] New Delhi, February 1 TASS -- TASS correspondent Sergey Latyshev reports:

A high appraisal of the new Soviet peace initiatives on nuclear disarmament has been given by the participants in a public rally here held on the occasion of the adoption of the New Delhi declaration. The rally was sponsored by the All-India Peace and Solidarity Organisation.

The New Delhi declaration, which was signed a year ago by the leaders of six nonaligned states, is a document of tremendous importance for preserving peace and security on earth. It has been an important milestone in the efforts of the peace forces of the world for preventing the threat of a nuclear catastrophe hanging over mankind, said India's Minister of State and Foreign Affairs Kocheril Roman Narayanan.

An end to a further build up of the arms race, ensuring peaceful coexistence of states with different socio-political systems is the sole alternative to nuclear death, he stressed. The Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva, which has been a turning point in contemporary history, has contributed in a large measure to a relaxation of international tensions. The leaders of the two great powers have firmly declared in Geneva that nuclear weapons race should not lead to military confrontation and destruction of human civilization. As far as India is concerned, the minister stressed, the Republic has no nuclear weapons and does not intend to develop them.

The fresh Soviet peace proposals contained in the statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on questions of disarmament, K.R. Narayanan said, are positive and deserve a most serious consideration. We support these fair and concrete proposals of the Soviet Union, which are close to the provisions contained in the New Delhi declaration, and believe that they should be most carefully examined by the U.S. Administration, he said. The Indian minister also pointed to the inadmissibility of spreading the arms race into outer space and called for a freeze on the nuclear arsenals.

Professor Rasheeduddin Khan, a prominent public figure of India, has expressed support for the USSR's fresh peaceful proposals on curbing the arms race and eliminating the threat of fear of a nuclear catastrophe. He stressed that unlike the USA the Soviet Union has positively responded to the New Delhi declaration and considered in putting forward its fresh peace initiatives also the wishes of the nonaligned countries. Rasheeduddin Khan pointed to the need for mobilizing broad international public circles in the fight for peace and security in the world.

Archbishop Mar-Gregorios of the Orthodox Church in India pointed out in his speech the direct connection between the unrestrained nuclear weapons race and hunger, privations and socio-economic backwardness, the conditions in which hundreds of millions of people live. The weapons race being built up by the Western countries and the criminal plans of the USA for a militarisation of outer space are manifestations of antediluvian mentality, which is absolutely inadmissible in this nuclear age. One cannot strengthen one's own security now at the expense of security of other nations, he said. The fresh Soviet peace proposals are directed not only at ensuring disarmament, but also at improving the living standards of the whole of mankind. Mar-Gregorios urged all people of goodwill to support the Soviet peace policy.

Libya Supports Proposal

LD060547 Moscow TASS in English 2354 GMT 5 Feb 86

[Text] New York, February 5 TASS -- Libya welcomes the proposals contained in the statement by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev on the need to terminate any nuclear blasts and prevent the arms race in outer space, which reflect the will of the international community, says a letter addressed by 'Abd al-Salam al-Turayki, secretary of the Libyan People's Bureau for External Relations, to U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar. It was released here as an official document of the U.N. General Assembly.

Afghan Defense Minister Hails Proposal

PM281144 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Jan 86 First Edition p 3

[Interview with Lieutenant General Nazar Muhammed, candidate member of the PDPA Central Committee Politburo and DRA defense minister by own correspondent Major A. Oliyniki "Comprehensive Peace Program"—date, place not given; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] The range of new initiatives of historic importance put forward in the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is ardently approved and widely supported among the most varied strata of the Afghan people. Live-ly commentaries on the initiatives are being voiced by the mass media, politicians, and public and religious figures.

Major A. Oliynik, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's permanent correspondent in Afghanistan, asked Lieutenant General Nazar Muhammad, candidate member of the PDPA Central Committee Politburo and DRA defense minister, to talk about how M.S. Gorbachev's statement has been received by Afghan Army personnel.

Afghan servicemen, like Afghanistan's entire revolutionary people, wholeheartedly support the Soviet peace initiatives, Lt Gen Nazar Muhammad said. They are evidence of the consistent peace-loving policy of the CPSU and the Soviet Government and their readiness to do everything to reaffirm in practical deeds the accords reached at the Soviet-U.S. summit in Geneva.

Beating swords into plowshares is a longstanding dream of mankind. And mankind should enter the new millennium without fearing for the lives of future generations or for the very existence of civilization. We Afghans are well aware what war is. This is now the 7th year that an undeclared war unleashed by the counterrevolution, with the broad support of the United States and Pakistan, has been waged against our country. The blood of the peaceful population is being spilled and hundreds of schools, hospitals, and mosques have been destroyed. That is why in our country and army we greeted with profound understanding the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, which accords with the most cherished aspirations of millions of Afghans.

It is not only a question of an entirely feasible comprehensive peace program. The fact that the program is aimed at resolving such vital problems as economic backwardness and the hunger and epidemics afflicting many peoples, including the population of Asia, is also of immense importance. The Soviet Union's initiatives entail relieving mankind of the burden of military spending and the arms race.

The new and wide-ranging peace program of the Land of the Soviets is unanimously approved by all categories of DRA Armed Forces servicemen. This is borne out by the atmosphere at the rallies and other mass political events being held at our units and formations and often directly during the lulls between battles. The text of the statement published in the newspaper HAQIQAT-E SARBAZ has been swiftly brought to the attention of all servicemen at political briefings. Our comrades from the limited contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan are a great help in the work to explain the major foreign policy actions of the CPSU and the Soviet State.

The Afghan people and their servicemen, Lt Gen Nazar Muhammad said in conclusion, warmly welcome the Soviet peace initiatives and for their part are prepared to make their contribution to ensuring peace and security in Asia and worldwide. Nuclear weapons must be removed from our planet forever!

Swedish Peace Committee

LD172107 Moscow TASS in English 2010 GMT 17 Feb 86

[Text] Stockholm, February 17 TASS -- The Soviet plan to eliminate nuclear weapons by the year 2000, expounded in a statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has met with an extremely positive response on the part of world public opinion and the leadership of state and government of many countries, the board of the Swedish National Peace Committee said in a statement.

It described the Soviet Union's extension of its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear blasts also as a highly important practical step. Putting an end to nuclear testing is now a key issue, the statement explained.

The need to achieve this goal, it noted, has been stressed also by the final report of the international independent commission on disarmament and security, which is led by Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme, and the New Delhi declaration of the leaders of six countries and many members of U.S. Congress have also gone on record to back this aim.

Besides, an end to nuclear weapons tests would pose an obstacle to U.S. plans for preparing for "star wars". the board of the Swedish National Peace Committee said. This is why the anti-war movement, it added, should help shape a public opinion that will demand an immediate and complete termination of all nuclear tests.

Belgian Socialists

LD172017 Moscow TASS in English 1908 GMT 17 Feb 86

[Text] Brussels February 17 TASS -- A session of the Bureau of the Belgian Socialist Party (French-speaking wing) here has highly evaluated the Soviet peace initiatives. The party's executive body issued a statement which says that the plan of eliminating nuclear weapons, proposed by the Soviet Union, is of great interest and opens up real opportunities for opening a dialogue. Walloon socialists received with great satisfaction the USSR's decision to extend the moratorium on nuclear tests, the document emphasizes. Moscow's recent proposals are the evidence of the Soviet side's readiness for negotiations on medium-range nuclear weapons, the statement says. The Bureau expressed the hope that the United States and its allies in NATO would give a constructive response to the Soviet initiative.

Italian Communist Leader

LD101853 Moscow TASS in English 1711 GMT 10 Feb 86

[Text] Rome, February 10 TASS -- Alessandro Natta, general secretary of the Italian Communist Party, has stressed the importance of the Soviet peace initiatives formulated in the statement of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev.

In an interview with the newspaper L'UNITA he pointed out the special importance of the Soviet proposal to remove altogether from the European Continent nuclear medium-range missiles. A. Natta pointed out that the USSR attached major importance to the role played by Europe in the disarmament process. In his opinion, West European countries can become a reliable political and economic partner of socialist countries.

He said that the policy of the Washington administration pursued in the interests of the militaristic forces led to the aggravation of contradictions in relations between the U.S. and its European allies and came up against the growing opposition throughout the world. A. Natta underlined that the attention of the world was centered around the Soviet foreign policy initiatives.

Polish Foreign Minister's Statement

PM181001 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[Article by M. Orzechowski, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and Polish minister of foreign affairs: "The Command of the Times"]

[Text] Warsaw, Feb—The 15 January 1986 statement of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, which contains new Soviet disarmament proposals was a political event of the highest order.

The statement was issued at an exceptionally difficult and dangerous moment in the international situation. The negative phenomena and trends which became particularly clearly visible at the beginning of the current decade have still not been overcome. People who favor an intensification of political tension and fueling of conflicts in various parts of the world, who oppose the territorial-political order which took shape in Europe after World War II, and advocate that all kinds of "embargoes" and "sanctions" be imposed in relations between states are still active in the West.

The U.S. military-industrial complex plays a sinister role in the definition of the aims and the choice of the instruments of the capitalist states' foreign policy and in promoting the growth of the international "infrastructure of tension." It seeks to induce other NATO states -- and unfortunately frequently not without success -- to increase their military budgets and to create [sozdaniye] ever new types of weapons and weapons systems, including nuclear ones.

The plans for the militarization of space envisaged in the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" advocated by President R. Reagan seem particularly criminal. They represent an aggressive concept. Their implementation would ultimately result in a qualitatively new stage of the arms race.

The full extent of their consequences and their cost, which would go beyond purely economic considerations, are difficult even to visualize. However, it is obvious that all previous accords on arms limitation would be violated. The opportunities for concluding new agreements would lose all real basis and the crisis of confidence would deepen. This would virtually nullify all chances of improving the international situation. Thus, hopes for an arms freeze and reduction, relaxation of tension, and elimination of the threat of a universal thermonuclear war would be thwarted, and mankind would find itself on a slippery path which would be difficult to leave.

However, the conviction that the world must not embark on the road is establishing itself increasingly firmly in the people's consciousness. Opportunities to curb the dangerous trends do exist. There are forces which are showing people a different direction of the development of civilization. They are connected with socialism. A historical merit of the Soviet Union's Leninist foreign policy is that at particularly critical moments it indicates real opportunities for changing the situation. This testifies to the profoundly humane nature of the USSR's international policy. In relations between states it puts peace and the preservation of life on the planet first and foremost.

The important initiative which the Soviet leader has submitted to the international community and which aims at the complete elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, has sprung up on precisely this fertile ground. It is the latest manifestation of the sense of tremendous responsibility for the fate of the world which is so essential today. It is an expression of the optimism which has always characterized Soviet foreign policy.

In his statement, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee rightly emphasized: "Finding effective ways of eliminating nuclear weapons is a feasible task if we tackle it without delay!"

The Soviet proposals are at the same time comprehensive and specific. They touch on all the fundamental problems of disarmament talks currently under way, bearing in mind their achievements and trends, and include key questions of space and strategic weapons, questions pertaining to medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, as well as conventional weapons, and the creation of an atmosphere of confidence.

They offer a way out of the situation on issues where progress was blocked for a long time because of the unconstructive position of the West. The Soviet Union's determination to continue the quest for ways to improve the situation is also indicated by the fact that it has decided to extend the moratorium on all nuclear explosion for another 3 months.

The USSR's proposals are a program on a historic scale, a program which offers realistic prospects and proposes specific ways of ridding mankind of the nuclear threat which hangs over it.

A 21st century without nuclear weapons is a bold aim, but given the good will of all interested states it is quite feasible. The program appeals not just to people's emotions but above all to their reason. It provides a clear alternative to the dubious "concepts" on which the bellicose U.S. plans on earth and in space are based.

On the one hand, there are the Soviet proposals to completely eliminate nuclear weapons, and on the other hand there is the U.S. obsession to replace them with an even more sophisticated system of space weapons. These are expressions of the diametrically different approaches to the fundamental issue of our time, the choice between war and peace. The Soviet approach provides for a real increase in international security, while the U.S. approach is based on the desire to achieve military and political superiority on the planet....

The point from which the Soviet peace initiative proceeds is the special responsibility borne by the USSR and the United States for the preservation of peace and international security. The statement also refers to, and defines, the role of other nuclear powers. The program submitted by the Soviet Union provides scope for all other states' and peoples' activity. After all, in the current complex and dangerous international situation peace and security are universal, indivisible assets to which no one can remain indifferent.

This applies particularly to Europe. This is where the watershed between the two major military and political groupings lies. Europe has been the seat of conflict more than once, but it has also acquired positive experience. And the Soviet leader bases his proposals on this experience. As the statement notes, this experience creates the preconditions for a special mission to be discharged by Europe: "This mission is the construction of a new edifice of detente."

The USSR's new proposals are firmly supported by the Warsaw Pact countries' joint peace platform. They are in keeping with the decisions adopted by the fraternal countries' top leaders and the achievements of their coordinated foreign policy as expressed in the documents of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee meeting in Sofia, and the Prague summit. Thus the Soviet program is not just a document which provides inspiration for the foreign policy activity of the fraternal states. It is, essentially, their joint program; as W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, has noted, "a suitable platform for laying the foundations for a better, secure future of the world."

We note with satisfaction that the conditions for solving many of the current problems, and in particular overcoming the impasse in the question of arms limitation and reduction, have improved lately. The meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan in Geneva created opportunities for deepening the dialogue between the two powers. We expect the United States to also avail itself of these opportunities. The Soviet peace program represents a substantial contribution in this respect.

Discussing the prospects for the development of the international situation and defining the main tasks of Polish foreign policy in 1986, the PZPR Central Committee Politburo welcomed and expressed appreciation for the important Soviet initiatives and expressed its full support for them. The Council of Ministers, and subsequently also the Polish Sejm, adopted a similar stance. This is a natural consequence of the fact that questions pertaining to peace, disarmament, and international security occupy a special place among the factors which determine Polish foreign policy, are deeply rooted in public consciousness, and enjoy the support of broad strata of the people. This approach is based, on the one hand, on the ideological foundations of our socialist system, and on the other hand on the dramatic history of our country whose experience was threatened by wars more than once. The fraternal friendship, alliance, and cooperation with the USSR and the other socialist community states guarantee Poland's sovereign and independent existence within secure borders.

Our support for the Soviet peace program is based on the conviction that its implementation would further strengthen all these values. The ideas expressed in the statement fully coincide with Poland's state interests.

The 27th CPSU Congress is due to open in a few days. It will be an event of historic importance for Soviet Communists and for the entire communist and workers movement. We are convinced that the 27th Congress will add a new vivid page to the theory and practice of socialist building. Our party will carefully study the decisions of the Soviet Communists' forum and apply them creatively in its own activity.

Czechoslovakia's Husak Statement

LD162204 Moscow TASS in English 2149 GMT 16 Feb 86

[Text] Prague, February 16 TASS - Prevention of a nuclear catastrophe, a peaceful resolution of all international issues are the dictates of the times, said Gustav Husak, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, addressing the report and election party conference of the Prague party city organisation of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.

In a number of areas of the world, the Czechoslovak leader continued, seats of military conflicts are smoldering. Mountains of mass destruction weapons have been accumulated in the world threatening to destroy human civilisation. That is precisely why, demonstrating a sense of responsibility for the planet's future, the Soviet Union has put forward a large-scale programme whose aim is to reduce and then totally eliminate nuclear weapons by the year of 2000. Yet, some circles in the USA are trying to use all sorts of pretexts to call these realistic proposals in question and evade giving a concrete answer to them.

They continue striving for universal domination, while the U.S. military-industrial complex is reluctant to give up the enormous profits from the arms race.

The Czechoslovak people is profoundly aware how deeply the questions of peace and war concern its vital interests. Therefore, it completely supports the Soviet peace initiatives. The tragic experience of our history and the price which has been paid for the country's freedom and independence are a reminder that it is only in alliance with the USSR and all countries of the socialist community that it is possible to ensure the peaceful development of Czechoslovakia, Gustav Husak said.

It can be said with gratification that the USSR's peaceful proposals meet with growing international support. There is growing conviction in the world of the need to resolve the international security issues on the basis of the principles proposed by the Soviet Union. This is a source of hope that it will be possible to divert the nuclear threat and ensure a peaceful future for mankind, Gustav Husak said in conclusion.

Bulgaria's Zhivkov Statement

LD141521 Moscow TASS in English 1504 GMT 14 Feb 86

[Text] Sofia, February 14 TASS -- The real way to preventing the danger of a world nuclear conflagration is shown by the Soviet Union's programme for the total elimination up to the year 2000 of nuclear weapons and prohibition of space strike weapons, Todor Zhivkov, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, said here.

The Bulgarian leader stressed that together with the fraternal countries of the socialist community, the People's Republic of Bulgaria is making its contribution to the struggle for putting an end to the arms race, for preventing its spreading into outer space, for general disarmament. In that connection he pointed out the need for turning the Balkans into a zone free from nuclear and chemical weapons, which is favoured by the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

CSSR Foreign Minister Chnoupek

PM121525 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[Article by Czechoslovak Foreign Minister Bohuslav Chnoupek: "A Chance That Must Not Be Missed"]

[Text] Prague, 10 Feb -- The Czechoslovak public, just like people of goodwill in all countries and continents, welcomes the USSR's far-reaching new peace initiatives on nuclear disarmament. We regard them as pivotal to the solution of the most burning problems concerning all mankind, to the choice between peace and war, detente and confrontation. The people of Czechoslovakia, a country located in such an important region as central Europe, fully support the voice of reason and wise statesmanship which again rang out from Moscow.

Yes, Czechoslovakia welcomes and supports the policy of good example, as demonstrated with particular clarity in the extraordinarily important program for nuclear disarmament through the year 2000. The CSSR regards it as a clear and unequivocal answer to the categorical demand of the epoch. The resolution of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and the CSSR Government on the statement of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, notes that it is a package of new proposals expressing the immutable peaceable essence of the Soviet Union's policy. These generally comprehensible and profoundly humane proposals testify to the highest measure of responsibility for the future of the human civilization.

The Soviet Union has submitted to the world, and primarily to the United States, a universal disarmament project based on the principle of equal security of the sides. It is a concretization of the clear and consistent line of the CPSU as proclaimed at the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and developed in the draft of the new edition of the CPSU Program. We share the view which represents the philosophical essence of this document, namely, no matter how great a threat to peace is posed by the aggressive imperialist circles, world war is not fatally inevitable. It is still possible to avert it and to save mankind from catastrophe. In this lies the historic mission of socialism and of all the progressive, peace-loving forces of the world.

We understand the new Soviet initiatives contained in M.S. Gorbachev's statement of 15 January this year as a scientifically substantiated master plan for a step-by-step solution -- in three stages -- of virtually all the key disarmament problems. These proposals make it possible to rid the world of nuclear weapons, not by means of the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative," so very dangerous and inordinately costly, but by means of eliminating existing nuclear arms, provided that both the USSR and the United States refrain from the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space strike arms. The Soviet proposals clearly define ways and suggest specific deadlines for achieving accords.

Time does not stand still. In the prevailing situation what is needed is not just declarations of goodwill and assurances of devotion to the cause of peace, but, first and foremost, practical actions in favor of this cause. The "spirit of Geneva" will not survive unless it is revitalized with specific steps expressing its essence; it will become a phantom. We therefore highly value the fact that the USSR's new proposals are consistent with the traditions of the Leninist international policy as a decisive factor for preserving peace. They are a continuation and development of the principled line of the CPSU and the entire Soviet people to do all in their power to rid the world of the danger of nuclear death.

The significance of the statement of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee lies in the fact that it combines mobilizing perspectives with a concrete plan for their realization. It is quite natural that this document has attracted tremendous attention and evoked a great positive response to the concrete Soviet proposals.

The statement simultaneously serves as a convincing reply to U.S. plans to launch a new round in the nuclear arms race by spreading these arms to space. The Soviet document puts forward an alternative to the "star wars" program. The USSR, as M.S. Gorbachev again confirmed in his interview to L'HUMANITE, unswervingly seeks to ensure equal security for all, by means of arms reduction and disarmament right up to the complete elimination of all types of mass destruction weapons. A legitimate question comes to mind: How is it possible to strengthen international security by creating [sozdaniye] new types of weapons and by further armament? On the contrary, a natural precondition for the elimination of nuclear weapons is the banning of space strike arms. Blocking the solution of the problem of space by implementing the "star wars" program indicates an unwillingness to end the nuclear arms race on earth.

An important factor on the path toward reducing nuclear weapons would be the adoption of the Soviet proposal for a moratorium on all nuclear explosions, which would preclude the possibility of creating [sozdavat] new generations of nuclear weapons, including space weapons. Whereas the rejection of this measure would result in a further arms buildup.

On the question of nuclear disarmament, the problem of verification [kontrol] is extraordinarily important. In the past, Western powers have used this issue quite unjustifiably to block progress in this sphere. We therefore highly value the clear confirmation of the invariable Soviet position. The USSR is no less interested in verification than all the others, and agrees to it being carried out by national as well as international technical means, including on-site inspection [v tom chisle i na meste]. But it must be a question of verification of disarmament and not of armament, as the West would have it.

The USSR's statement also gives concrete expression to other accords contained in the Soviet-U.S. joint document adopted in Geneva. It puts forward a program for the elimination of chemical weapons. It adds impetus to the advancement of the cause of the reduction of conventional arms and armed forces and the enhancement of the effectiveness and intensification of bilateral and multilateral disarmament talks. The statement also touches on other important issues. Furthermore, everything the USSR proposes is in the nature of realistic and phased steps. The main thing is to show good political will to achieve progress.

Europe is to occupy a special place in the implementation of the extensive package of proposals aimed at achieving a fundamental breakthrough in favor of the policy of peace. Our continent has already set an example of a new approach to questions of peace, cooperation, and international trust. I have in mind the contribution made to detente by CSCE. On countless occasions lately we have been able to see for ourselves the viability of detente and the interest shown in reviving it. Now new impetus must be added to this process, new life must be breathed into it in all spheres and through the efforts of all its participants.

We welcome the circumstances that the USSR's counterproposals aimed at achieving progress at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe point in this same direction. The CSSR supports the proposition that it is necessary right now to reduce the numerical strength of forces taking part in large-scale land and air force exercises.

It seems that at the Vienna talks an outline of a possible solution to the reduction of Soviet and U.S. forces and the subsequent freezing of the level of Warsaw Pact and NATO armed forces in central Europe is emerging.

Czechoslovakia believes quite unequivocally that if the United States and its Western allies act as responsibly as the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, this will make it possible to improve the international situation and resolve complex international problems. We know that it is not easy to achieve this, but we are convinced that the peace policy of the Soviet Union and the entire fraternal community and the mounting efforts of peace-loving and realistically minded people throughout the world will make it possible to preserve peace for current and future generations.

Czechoslovakia will continue to play an active part in this struggle. We are prepared to spare no effort to contribute to the implementation of the new Soviet proposals so that the tremendous chance they offer mankind is taken and so that people can enter the new millennium confidently and without fear for their existence.

GDR's Honecker

LD092258 Moscow TASS in English 2012 GMT 9 Feb 86

[Text] Berlin, February 9 TASS -- The proposal put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, that all nuclear weapons be eliminated by the year of 2000 has met with broad approval of international public. This is the only programme of its kind for mankind's rescue from a nuclear catastrophe, the programme which opens up a truly history-making possibility of the world's peaceful future. It is the dictates of common sense to use this opportunity, Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany Central Committee, chairman of the GDR Council of State, told a conference of the Berlin party district organization held here.

There are, certainly, people, he continued, including in the FRG, who dislike such a trend. Certain "apostles of freedom" talking about peace are expressing objections against such developments, which bring peoples closer rather than disunite them. The decisive thing for these people is not the elimination of nuclear threat, not putting an end to the arms race on earth and its not-spreading into outer space, but fear that their inventions about a "threat from the East" will become less effective as a result of active peaceful cooperation between states with different social systems.

Erich Honecker stressed responsibility for ensuring peace, which rests on both German states and declared that not only the GDR, but also the FRG should under no pretext participate in a militarisation of outer space, so that during the period of talks between the USSR and the USA both German states should take no steps that can complicate these talks. By resolutely dissociating itself from the SDI programme, he stressed, the FRG could make its contribution to the success of the Soviet-American talks.

PRAVDA Cites Honecker Praise

PM121059 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Feb 86 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Broad Approval"]

[Text] Berlin, 10 Feb -- The program to totally eliminate nuclear weapons everywhere, which was put forward in the Statement by M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, has found broad approval and support in the GDR, and also among the international public. This was stated by E. Honecker, SED Central Committee general secretary and chairman of the GDR State Council, at a conference of the Berlin SED district organization held here. The bold and constructive Soviet peace initiatives provide a historic chance to save mankind from a nuclear catastrophe and ensure the world's peaceful future. To use this opportunity is the command of reason, the GDR leader notes. It is essential to bring about a radical improvement in the international situation and reliably ensure the peoples' security in the spirit of the Soviet-U.S. accords reached in Geneva.

E. Honecker stressed that the development of good-neighborly relations between European states in the spheres of politics, the economy, culture, science, and technology is in the peoples' interests. Noting the responsibility of both German states -- the GDR and the FRG -- for the fate of peace on the continent, the GDR leader spoke in favor of neither the GDR nor the FRG participating in the militarization of space under any pretext and neither German state taking any steps in the period of negotiations between the USSR and the United States that could complicate these negotiations. By decisively dissociating itself from the SDI program, he stressed, the FRG could make its own contribution to the success of talks between the USSR and the United States.

Hungary Hails Soviet Program

PM121137 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "High Assessment"]

[Text] Budapest, 11 Feb -- The Soviet Union's constructive, concrete initiatives, put forward in the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, are of exceptionally great significance in ensuring mankind's peaceful future. They are directed toward the elimination of nuclear arms, the prevention of the militarization of outer space, and the general and complete destruction of chemical weapons. This is spoken of in a statement issued here by the Hungarian National Assembly Foreign Affairs Commission.

The Soviet proposals, the document notes, take account of the security interests of all interested parties. They offer a good opportunity for the phased, fair resolution of the problems which exist and for the elaboration of compromise solutions at international disarmament forums.

The Hungarian National Assembly Foreign Affairs Commission fully supports and approves the large-scale disarmament program put forward by the USSR. All realistically minded politicians and the world's peace-loving forces must do everything to promote the realization of concrete measures aimed at strengthening international security and eliminating nuclear weapons, the statement stresses.

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

TASS: U.S. STANCE ON VERIFICATION 'GROUNDLESS'

LD311530 Moscow TASS in English 1507 GMT 31 Jan 86

["Arguments by Opponents of Nuclear Disarmament Untenable"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, January 31 TASS -- TASS commentator Vasilii Kharkov writes: World public opinion sees the reality of the prospect of completely eliminating nuclear weapons all over the globe in the next 15 years in that the Soviet Union's disarmament programs sets forth a concrete plan of stage-by-stage steps towards the goal and provides for strict control over their implementation.

In the copious flow of commentary on the statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, that has spelled out this program, much attention is being paid to this organic link between practical actions and verification. THE WASHINGTON POST today described the "approach to verification" as "the most intriguing aspect" of the latest Soviet proposals.

The paper urged the U.S. Administration to consider the "substantive terms" suggested by Moscow in a positive spirit.

The Soviet Union stands for effective verification in all fields of arms limitation and reduction and disarmament. Take, for example, an end to all nuclear blasts, which is an important practical step to eliminating nuclear weapons. The American side constantly claimed in the past that the verification problem was an obstacle to signing an agreement on a bilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions. Now such claims are totally groundless. The USSR has declared plainly that it is prepared to employ any forms of verification, including national-technical means, international monitoring arrangements and on-site inspections. The Soviet Union's readiness for on-site inspections, the London TIMES commented, had removed what the West had considered the most tangible objection to an end to nuclear testing.

The Soviet Union's position of principle in the issue of outer space is well-known. Space should be kept peaceful and there should be no strike arms deployed there. Let this be verified by the strictest control, including the opening of corresponding laboratories to inspection, the Soviet Union says.

There is no verification problem also as regards a ban on chemical weapons and their destruction. In this field too the USSR stands for the strictest control, including international on-site inspections.

Or take, for instance, the Vienna talks where the Soviet Union has also proposed adequate verification measures both to monitor the reduction of troops and armaments and to make certain that the levels of armed forces do not increase. Apart from the national technical means of verification, the Soviet Union suggests a whole number of extra other effective measures to ensure reliable control over compliance with a future agreement.

So one cannot fail to see that the Soviet Union, suggesting a direct way out of the present nuclear blind alley, backs the proposal up with substantial practical actions. The peoples expect the United States to take a constructive and businesslike stand.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1262

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

MOSCOW VIEWS MORATORIUM, VERIFICATION PROPOSALS

LD110312 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 10 Feb 86

[Studio discussion with unidentified presenter and Soviet "experts" Grigory Khozin and Lev Semeyko]

[Text] [Presenter] On the 15th of last month Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev made a statement proposing the abolition of nuclear warheads and their delivery vehicles in three stages over a period of 15 years, coupled with a ban on the development of space strike weapons. The Soviet plan proposes that during the very first stage, that is within 5 to 8 years, the Soviet Union and the United States halve their nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territories and accept a ban on the militarization of space.

The Soviet Union links the reduction in nuclear arms with a ban on space weapons because otherwise disarmament is impossible. How could agreement possibly be reached on abolishing nuclear weapons while, at the same time dangerous and expensive new weapons systems are being developed? In addition to this the Soviet Union has extended its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions. Why has Moscow taken this step and what has been Washington's reaction to it? With me in the studio today to discuss these and other questions are two Soviet experts, Grigoriy Khozin and Lev Semeyko. Lev Semeyko speaks first:

[Semeyko] The Soviet invitation to join this moratorium, has evoked a very disappointing reaction from Washington. The American objection to this is that the Soviet Union allegedly has carried out more explosions than the United States did before Moscow announced its moratorium. This is just not so. According to SIPRI, the Stockholm-based international peace research institute, by January of this year when the Soviet Union extended its moratorium the United States had set off 772 blasts, the Soviet Union 556. However, it is not just a matter of these figures. The Soviet nuclear disarmament program calls for the abolition of nuclear weapons altogether. Why, in that case, test new weapons of nuclear destruction?

[Presenter] There was a time when the United States was urging a moratorium on nuclear tests. Grigoriy Khozin:

[Khozin] When we examine the evolution of American strategic weapons we find that at certain points the United States urged stopping nuclear tests and embarking on a vigorous dialogue. Why? Because the United States was completing a certain phase of its testing, having tested certain new systems. Having thus gained an advantage, it wanted to consolidate it. Today its unwillingness to join the Soviet moratorium is linked

above all with its work on what it calls its Strategic Defense Initiative, SDI. One of the elements in this system is again to be a nuclear weapon, in one of its modifications. Charges for such devices are now being tested at the Nevada proving ground and they are to become a mainstay of the entire "star wars" program by means of which it is hoped to attain military superiority.

[Presenter] It is thus a fact that the Soviet Union has carried out fewer nuclear explosions than the United States has. But perhaps it is thought in Washington that the Soviet Union has concluded a certain series of nuclear tests which the United States hasn't yet carried out. Back to Grigoriy Khozin:

[Khozin] The nuclear tests carried out by the Soviet Union have, even according to Western experts, nothing to do with space-based weapons. Besides the Soviet Union has now conducted no explosions for almost a year. There is thus an obvious imbalance.

While the Soviet Union last month extended its moratorium for another 3 months, the United States continues its explosions and is working to develop new nuclear weapons for use in space. Obviously this cannot continue indefinitely.

[Presenter] The nuclear devices now being tested in Nevada could become a basis for qualitatively new weapons under the SDI program. How can this possibly be reconciled with the American Administration's statements that SDI will make nuclear weapons obsolescent and that the system will contain no nuclear weapons? Grigoriy Khozin:

[Khozin] I have carefully studied the American defense department's report on SDI progress which covers all the components of the program. It is clear that the emphasis is on the nuclear components. What is envisaged is the development of nuclear space weapons so powerful that they could be used only for offensive purposes. They could serve for a first disarming strike from space at ground targets with the speed of light because the target would in this case be struck not by the nuclear blast itself, but by its directed energy. Some Western experts call such weapons non-nuclear. Wrong. This is merely a modification of a directed nuclear weapon.

[Presenter] In the nuclear disarmament program proposed by the Soviet Union, Western experts have noted the Soviet approach to verification problems. Here is Lev Semeyko:

[Semeyko] Our approach to the problem may be summed up as follows: The scale of verification depends on the scale of disarmament. In other words if there is \$1 worth of disarmament, there must be \$1 worth of verification. If there is a million dollars worth of disarmament, there must be corresponding verification. Given the scale of disarmament we propose, verification would be very expensive. Take intermediate range missiles. We are in favor of international commissions coming to observe the scrapping of the warheads and bodies of SS-20 missiles. For our part we would like to be present at similar procedures in the United States and then, at subsequent stages of disarmament in Britain and France. We also take a favourable view of on-site verification.

[Presenter] Now Grigoriy Khozin:

[Khozin] Verification has always been a sticky point in discussions on arms limitation and reduction. This is a grim heritage of the days of the cold war when the United States on the pretext of verification sought to unilaterally obtain secret information. It is therefore not difficult to see why at certain stages some countries, including the Soviet Union, objected to attempts to force on-site inspection on them.

This would have violated the national interests of these countries. But you must also remember that the Soviet Union is just as interested in verification as other countries are and there are no impartial reasons for reproaching us on this point. These reproaches were made in situations in which we were being asked to accept on-site inspection while the other side either evaded such procedures or tried to replace them with something else. For example the United States declared it was prepared to invite the Soviet Union to witness underground nuclear tests although verification should have covered other sites which could have been the source of a threat to us.

[Presenter] What exactly is said in the Soviet statement with respect to verification? Grigoriy Khozin:

[Khozin] The Soviet Union considers that present day national technical facilities are sufficient to demonstrate compliance with treaty provisions. But we are prepared to accept on-site inspection to confirm that no combat system, or system that could be considered such, will say, rise into space. We are also prepared to reach agreement on any other additional verification procedures.

This also applies to fundamentally new weapons systems, laser weapons and beam weapons. This being so, Western assertions that the verification problem is an obstacle to agreement are absolutely groundless.

[Presenter] And there we conclude this program about the Soviet program of nuclear disarmament. Our guest speakers were the Soviet experts, Grigoriy Khozin and Lev Semeyko.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1262

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET EXPERTS EXPLAIN MISSILE WITHDRAWAL PROPOSALS

Press Conference Reported

AU122200 Vienna Domestic Service in German 1700 GMT 12 Feb 86

[Raimund Lowe report on Soviet press conference in Vienna's Concordia press club today]

[Text] This morning a delegation of Soviet experts in the crammed hall of Vienna's Concordia press club explained that, as before, Moscow is still waiting for a positive Western response to the Soviet proposal for halving the strategic nuclear weapons of the two superpowers with the prospect of the complete destruction of all nuclear arms stockpiles throughout the world.

Four high-ranking Soviet foreign policy experts and military men faced questions from Western journalists for almost 2 hours, an event that would have been most unusual even a few years ago. Today, however, it is evidently part and parcel of the style of General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev. Andrey Grachev, head of the powerful information department of the CPSU Central Committee [as heard], pointed out that he was delighted to see the increased international interest in Soviet domestic and foreign policy in recent times. He said the delegation had come in order to meet this demand. The specific reason for the visit to Vienna: The explanation of the disarmament initiative presented by Mikhail Gorbachev on 15 January.

Andrey Grachev:

[Begin recording in Russian fading into German translation] The gist of the new complex of Soviet peace initiatives is a program calculated for 15 years and it is intended to completely eliminate the nuclear arsenals gradually up to 2000. Under a three-stage plan, according to Gorbachev's proposal, the United States and the Soviet Union shall, up to 1990, halve their strategic nuclear weapons. The tactical nuclear weapons and the nuclear arsenals of France and Great Britain shall also be reduced in the nineties and the world should be free of nuclear weapons at the beginning of the new millenium. Under a worldwide agreement, all states of the earth should bind themselves to never again build nuclear weapons. In order to make this visionary plan also appear realistic, the Soviet Union has halted its nuclear tests as a unilateral advance concession which is limited till 31 March [end recording]

The big snag in all this is that Moscow regards Washington's renunciation of SDI as a precondition. Ronald Reagan's pet project, the Strategic Defense Initiative, also termed "star wars," shall not be realized. The Soviet side charges the United States with taking a gigantic step ahead in the arms race through SDI. But is not research in the same area also being conducted in the Soviet Union? Andrey Kokoshin, deputy director of the United States and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences says: [Begin recording in Russian fading into German translation] Such assertions do not contain a grain of truth. The Soviet Union does not develop either offensive space weapons nor is there any research work being undertaken to create an antimissile system in outer space to protect our own territory. [end recording]

But have not Red Army generals themselves time and again pointed out that Soviet scientists are very capable of utilizing outer space for the protection of their territory? [Begin recording] The Soviet Union has indeed carried out work to develop antisatellite weapons. This is true. This was done after the United States developed a series of systems which it subsequently renounced. In any case, the Soviet antisatellite system has not been tested. And the Soviet Union has imposed a moratorium on itself since August 1983. [end recording]

Gorbachev also made a spectacular proposal for Europe, the continent which bristles with the most weapons, provided NATO was ready to withdraw the new intermediate range missiles -- Pershing-2 and cruise missiles.

Nikolay Portugalov, also a representative of the information department of the CPSU Central Committee says: [Begin recording in German] We are ready to liquidate the SS-20 missile in the European zone, in the European sector of the Soviet Union, something that means absolutely unequivocally: to destroy them. And it is not only the missiles that will be destroyed, but also the pertinent infrastructure, that is, everything connected with the launching pads.

Well, the European sector which I mentioned before not only extends to the Ural Mountains, but to the 80th meridian of longitude, that is, virtually to a limit where our missiles -- intermediate range missiles -- can no longer reach the territories of the European NATO countries.

There exists no linkage at all between all the other Soviet proposals, including "star wars," the ban on extending the arms race into outer space, and our other proposals, and the proposal for destroying intermediate range missiles in the European sector. This is absolutely unambiguous. [end recording]

In plain words this means that even without an agreement on "star wars," Moscow would be ready for disarmament in the intermediate weapons sector in Europe. Beautiful words, which must, undoubtedly, be seen within the framework of a worldwide propaganda battle between East and West. But propaganda with disarmament proposals should be preferred to threatening military gestures any time.

Portugalov's Statement on SS-20's

AU130943 Vienna Television Service in German 1830 GMT 12 Feb 86

[Excerpt from statement by Nikolay Portugalov, "representative of the information department at the CPSU Central Committee," at a press conference in the Vienna Concordia press club on 12 February - videotaped]

[Text] Our proposal is completely clear: We are ready to liquidate the SS-20 missiles in the European zone, the European sector of the Soviet Union, which, to be absolutely unequivocal, means to destroy them. And it is not only the missiles that will be destroyed, but also the pertinent infrastructure, that is, everything connected with the launching pads.

It is frequently held against us that these are mobile systems which could quite easily and at rather short notice be moved back from Asia to Europe. Our proposal does not aim at organizing the moving back and forth of missiles. One does not adopt a commitment in order to immediately violate it. But there are also some objective conditions which make this appear extremely difficult to understand [voellig abstrus]. Look here, if one were to operate with such logic, then one could say: The Americans, according to the data and information of our general staff -- and our supreme general staff will probably bear me out on this -- have by now already produced nearly 900 Pershing missiles. Now, I am wondering: They have deployed -- well, 108, officially, in the FRG, according to official reports, and with some spares, according to press reports. What do they need another, roughly 700, for, then? There is no use for them in the United States. Thus, at a suitable opportunity they can be brought to Europe and with (?big lift) even much faster than [we could bring ours] with our infrastructure from Siberia.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1262

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRAVDA EDITORIAL OUTLINES ARMS INITIATIVES

PM241626 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[Editorial article: "Program of Nuclear Disarmament"]

[Text] The Soviet Union is proposing that the implementation of a program to rid mankind of the fear of a nuclear catastrophe begin as of this year, 1986, which has been declared International Peace Year by the United Nations. This specific program, elaborated in detail and calculated for an historically brief period of 15 years -- that is, until the coming of the year 2000 -- is contained in the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, published 15 January.

Unlike the wishes expressed by Western states' official figures from time to time -- wishes which are fine-sounding, but often intended to delude public opinion -- the Soviet program for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the world is specific in terms of both procedure and deadlines for implementation. It is in this respect that it is fundamentally new and significant. It incorporates three organically linked stages stemming one from another and, in a number of their elements, overlapping [vzaimopronikayushchiy].

It is proposed that the first stage would witness the start of a Soviet and U.S. nuclear arms reduction, which would set an example for other states possessing such weapons. Within a period of 5-8 years both states would have to halve their nuclear weapons which can reach each other's territory, after which no more than 6,000 charges would be retained on the corresponding delivery vehicles remaining on each side.

An exceptionally important factor is cited as a special proviso here: The appearance of space strike weapons would cancel out the hope of ridding mankind of nuclear weapons. A radical reduction in such weapons is possible only if the Soviet Union and the United States renounce the development [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space strike arms.

As for the medium-range Soviet and U.S. missiles -- both ballistic and cruise -- sited in the European zone, their complete elimination is envisaged at the very first stage. This would be a major step along the path of ridding the European Continent of nuclear weapons.

At the same time the United States must assume a commitment not to supply its missiles -- strategic or medium-range -- to other countries, while Britain and France must assume a commitment not to build up their own nuclear arms.

Incidentally, some people in the West have seen a resemblance to the "zero option" advanced by the United States in the Soviet proposal on medium-range missiles. In reality they have nothing in common. The intention of the U.S. "zero option" was that the Soviet Union should destroy its medium-range missiles not only in the European zone, but also in the east of the country without, however, ruling out the possibility of the United States transferring such missiles to its allies or of Britain and France building up their own nuclear arms.

It is also essential that the Soviet Union and the United States agree from the very start of ending any nuclear tests and appeal to other states to join this moratorium as soon as possible. Being important in itself, this problem merits separate examination. Let us make note here of the fact that the Soviet Union took a bold step in introducing a unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions as of 6 August and has now, again demonstrating goodwill, extended it until 31 March.

Beginning no later than 1990 and continuing for 5-7 years, the second stage, according to the Soviet program, would be characterized by the inclusion of the other nuclear powers in the nuclear disarmament process. For them it would begin with the adoption of a commitment to freeze their nuclear arms and not have them on other countries' territory.

Meanwhile the Soviet Union and the United States, continuing the reductions agreed on at the first stage and implementing further measures to eliminate medium-range nuclear arms, would freeze their tactical nuclear means. And when the Soviet Union and the United States have halved their nuclear arms which can reach other's territory, the tactical nuclear weapons of all the nuclear powers would be eliminated.

The reduction of other countries' nuclear arsenals would thus begin only at the second stage and with the destruction for the time being of only tactical weapons. Posing the question in this way takes account of the positions of Britain, France, and China, whose leaders have stated that their countries would be prepared to join the nuclear disarmament process when the Soviet Union and the United States have substantially reduced their nuclear potentials.

At this point it is appropriate to draw attention to the fact that the Soviet program has been drawn up with due consideration for the fact that the currently prevailing balance of forces in the world is to be maintained at all stages of its implementation, but at an increasingly lower level. No threat to anyone's security will be created at any moment of its implementation.

At the second stage, the USSR-U.S. accord on banning space strike weapons must become multilateral with the obligatory participation of the leading industrial powers. At the same stage, all the nuclear powers would end nuclear weapons tests.

One more point will require implementation of the second stage: the institution of a ban on the creation [sozdaniye] of non-nuclear weapons based on new physical principles. They include in particular beam, radio wave, infrasonic, and genetic weapons which, in terms of their destructive potential, could be no less dangerous than already existing mass destruction weapons.

Finally, at the third stage, which is to begin no later than in 1995 and conclude by the end of 1999, it is envisaged that all remaining nuclear weapons will be eliminated and a universal accord ensuring that they never reemerge will be elaborated.

Of course, the measures contained in the Soviet program will require the elaboration of special procedures for the destruction of nuclear munitions and for the dismantling, conversion, or destruction of delivery vehicles. The extent and location of this destruction must be coordinated at all stages and monitoring of the fulfillment of this process will be effected both by national technical means and with the help of international procedures including, if necessary, on-site inspection. The Soviet Union declares that it is prepared to agree on any other additional monitoring measures; this nullifies the last arguments by the opponents of disarmament who claim that, without proper monitoring, there is apparently no guarantee that the relevant agreements will be observed.

In a basic outline, this is the Soviet program for the total elimination of nuclear weapons given the prohibition of space strike weapons. It accords with the objectives and subject of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva, which were confirmed as a result of the summit meeting. It is aimed at ensuring that, instead of the creation [sozdaniye] of new space weapons -- which are extremely dangerous for mankind, but are allegedly meant to render nuclear arms unnecessary -- the destruction of these actual arms is undertaken. The Washington administration, which has repeatedly declared its commitment to the idea of eliminating nuclear weapons, is thus being offered an opportunity to tackle this in practice.

The new peace initiatives outlined in the statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee have received ardent approval and support from the Soviet people. They have encountered a great deal of positive response abroad, including among statesmen from many Western countries.

As for the United States, which is the primary addressee of the Soviet proposals, a statement by President R. Reagan described by the Western press as "cautious and carefully considered" has been disseminated there. Unfortunately, there has been nothing more than that so far.

Furthermore, attention is attracted to other statements by leading figures in Washington which again raise questions capable only of retarding the practical solution of the problems as proposed by the Soviet Union. They include adherence to the "star wars" plan claims that it is "necessary" for the United States to continue nuclear explosions in order to overcome a supposed "lag" behind the Soviet Union, and references of the same old kind -- now completely unfounded -- to "difficulties" in monitoring the process of nuclear disarmament....

What can be said in this connection? In the absence of political will to resolve the task posed by life, it is, of course, possible to find as many excuses as you like. But the situation which has developed in the world today demands of statesmen that they resolutely cast aside all kinds of tricks and national egoism and, especially, personal ambitions.

Mankind is justified in hoping that it will enter the third millennium of our era free from the threat of nuclear catastrophe. The Soviet program for the elimination of nuclear weapons opens the way to the materialization of this hope.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1262

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR'S ARBATOV SEES CHANCE FOR 'NORMALIZATION' OF RELATIONS

LD102304 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 2120 GMT 10 Feb 86

[Interview with Georgiy Arkadyevich Arbatov, director of the United States of America and Canada Institute in Moscow by Budapest Radio correspondents Jozsef Barath and Jozsef Havel; Arbatov answers in Russian with superimposed Hungarian translation; date not given--recorded]

[Excerpts] [Havel] We are in the Moscow-based United States of America Research Institute. The building is the former palace of Princes Volkonskiy [as printed]: Its atmosphere recalls "War and Peace" by Tolstoy. In fact we are in one of the workshops of Soviet foreign policy; its leader is Academician Georgiy Arbatov, and it is he whom we address.

[Barath] Georgiy Arkadyevich, we know that in the past year Soviet foreign policy has become active in the various regions of the world; in Europe, in Asia, in the Pacific Ocean region. Does this mean that nowadays less importance is attributed to the United States?

[Arbatov] You know, sometimes it would be very pleasant to forget about the United States, but we cannot do so because we see very well how much depends on Soviet-U.S. relations. We do not narrow down the entire world to the United States: We do not see the world through the prism of Soviet-U.S. relations. I would not say that we pay greater attention to one region at the expense of another.

Recently, Soviet foreign policy activity has increased in every direction, in the direction of the United States as well. The 15 January declaration addresses the entire world, but the first phase of disarmament affects the United States first of all.

[Havel] What is the U.S. response to the Gorbachev proposals?

[Arbatov] You know, we cannot have enough patience until the U.S. reply arrives. So far we have only heard some kind of muttering that it is interesting, that it must be studied, that it is the old content in new wrapping. Others talk about dangerous perfidiousness. Reagan himself only said that the plan is being studied. This, of course, is still better than immediate rejection, but we cannot consider all this as a reply. Of course, it is only the most naive people in the United States who can think that these proposals can be left without answer. They must be answered concretely and every single point must be given a reply. This is expected not only by us, but by international public opinion and what is more, the U.S. public opinion also.

A twin difficulty arises with the answers. First, the spirit of our proposals is in contrast to the policy of the United States in the past 5 years, that is, it demands a change. Second, our proposals mean a radical turn regarding any tradition hitherto, even in respect to existing arms limitation, because what is at issue now is the destruction of all offensive weapons.

In the past few days, I have spoken with people of goodwill who are supporting disarmament, but even they are puzzled as to how there can be a life without weapons. For what is at issue here is not only the destruction of nuclear weapons, but chemical and conventional weapons as well.

[Havel] Is the spirit of Geneva operating?

[Arbatov] Geneva has been useful, although no agreement was concluded on the most important issues. Geneva has created an atmosphere in which it was easier to come out with new initiatives.

[Barath] Is it realistic to hope that the United States will join the unilateral Soviet moratorium regarding nuclear test explosions?

[Arbatov] The Soviet proposals have brought the moment of truth: They force the other governments, that of the United States included, to nail their colors to the mast. Take the moratorium for example. When we first raised it, it was said that the Russians were not honest, they carried out more explosions than anybody else -- which, by the way, is not true -- and now they, the Russians, propose to the Americans to stop. By now, however, it is clear to everybody that it is the United States which is ahead. So one argument thus falls by the wayside. The second argument was verification, that the Russians wouldn't agree to it. Now we have said that any form of verification would suit us. The second argument has fallen. The United States is at a crossroads: Either it joins the moratorium and resumes negotiations with us on stopping nuclear experiments or openly admits that it wants to continue the arms race.

[Havel] A year and a half ago when I began work in Moscow, I read then in one of your articles that Soviet-U.S. relations were at a low point. How do you see this now?

[Arbatov] The situation has somewhat improved in the last year and a half. There are more visits, dialogues in the spheres of culture and air traffic. The most important problems are still unsolved, but it is important that the process has started and this process includes at least a further two summits. This is important because the very fact of a meeting compels us to think, to prepare. By the way, there is no guarantee for anything, but we have greater reason to think that in the coming years a kind of normalization can be expected in Soviet-U.S. relations. It must be seen in its historical context. Relations did not begin in the 1980's and will not end there either -- although the time factor is becoming more and more important. Every wasted year matters more and more.

[Barath] Which are those areas where, in your opinion, realistic conditions exist for an advance?

[Arbatov] It seems to me that in the end it is now time to move from declarations to deeds. The United States has announced several times that it supports nuclear disarmament, but we do not see the practical consequence of this. We have made several steps in advance. Small things, cosmetics, do not solve anything. It would be easy to reach agreement in peripheral problems, but this is not what we would like and the world does not expect this either. We must achieve agreement on the decisive issues.

[Barath] Is it, therefore, the Strategic Defense Initiative which is decisive? Is it what everything else depends on?

[Arbatov] The key question is arms limitation, first of all that of nuclear weapons. In what respect is the Strategic Defense Initiative decisive? In the sense that if the United States implements the "star wars" program then the limitation of strategic weapons is impossible if only because space weapons, in the event they are created, become a part of strategic offensive weapons. At the same time we should not link the cause of limiting medium-range nuclear missiles with the Strategic Defense Initiative. This may be done independently. We do not link with it the armed forces limitation negotiations in Vienna; these may be solved separately even today. And it is true in the case of the themes of the Stockholm Conference. Even in the area of arms limitation many things may be solved independently of the Strategic Defense Initiative. At the same time we cannot expect that the world will become safer if space militarization is implemented.

[Havel] You, as an Americanist, are observing at very close quarters the activity of Ronald Reagan. How do you assess the political profile of the U.S. President?

[Arbatov] I think the time is still to come for Reagan to give an answer to the principal question, that is, what results are to be achieved in his presidential reign. It is not the solution of economic issues which will be decisive in this respect. The question of security is decisive for the Americans as well, that is, whether security has decreased or increased. It is on this basis that the world will judge him. I think Reagan has every opportunity to enter history as a President who achieved something to be remembered for many long years. However, there is another possibility as well. I am prepared to speak in more detail in response to your question in 2 and 1/2 years time.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1262

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET JOURNAL REVIEWS GORBACHEV'S FALL 1985 VISIT TO FRANCE

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 12, Dec 85 pp 3-8

[Article by A. Vtorov: "USSR-France: Through a Dialogue to Greater Understanding and Detente"]

[Text]

The official visit of Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, to France, which took place from October 2 to 5 this year, was an extremely important action of Soviet foreign policy and a major event in world relations. This is increasingly felt with the passage of the time since the visit. The top-level Soviet-French talks and the integral programme for improving the international situation advanced by the Soviet leader generated broad and favourable repercussions in Europe and the rest of the world.

To fully assess the significance of this, one must be aware of the actual situation in the world. Today mankind has reached the point where an uncontrollable process connected with the use of the latest achievements of science and technology for military purposes can start. On the agenda are a major qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and the creation of new types of conventional armaments which are coming close to the level of nuclear weapons in their destructive capability. The main issue, the spread of the arms race to outer space, threatens to undermine the already shaky strategic stability. The very existence of human civilisation can be jeopardised.

Running throughout all the speeches of Mikhail Gorbachev both prior to his visit to France and during it is the idea that the time has come to put an end to this abnormal and highly dangerous international situation. It is now imperative to take a fresh look at the present situation, halt the escalation of armaments, and build relations between states with different social systems in such a way as to go over, through detente, to stable and reliable structure of international security.

The foreign policy line of the Soviet state, which, like that of any other country, is conditioned above all by domestic needs, is firmly oriented to peaceful coexistence, to peace. In drafting the plans for the USSR's social and economic development for the 12th five-year-plan period and for the period ending in the year 2000, the CPSU gives priority to the all-round acceleration of social and economic progress for improving the well-being of the people. This general line presupposes a tranquil, normal international situation, and cooperation with the socialist and capitalist countries within the framework of the international division of labour.

The Soviet Union declares not only in words its desire to reach a turn-about for the better in world affairs; it is backing this up with practical steps. To supplement the Soviet Union's earlier pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and the moratorium on the extending of antisatellite weapons to outer space and the deployment of medium-range missiles and other countermeasures in Europe, as well as on all nuclear explosions, Mikhail

Gorbachev, delivering before French parliamentarians a very impressive policy-making speech, made known the new Soviet initiatives. At the Soviet-American talks in Geneva the USSR proposed reaching agreement on a total ban on the space strike weapons and a truly drastic, by 50 per cent, cut in the nuclear weapons capable of reaching each other's territory. This is creating a qualitatively different situation, which demands a new look at the problem of nuclear armaments in Europe. Attempting to invigorate the talks and find new, more practical approaches to the problem of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, the Soviet Union has considered it possible—taking into account the wishes of Western Europe as well—to set about drafting a separate accord on this type of weapons, and simultaneously proposed to France and Britain to begin direct talks on this subject and try to pool efforts to find a mutually acceptable solution. Here the Soviet side stressed in particular that the USSR is not intent on jeopardising the security of France or on building its own security at the expense of the security of others. The Soviet Union is not demanding that France reduce its nuclear potential or halt its military programmes. Nor is it calling upon France to sit down at the negotiating table today. The essence of the Soviet proposal is to begin a direct—without mediators—exchange of views with France on a problem vital to all European peoples so as to subsequently find some solution, possibly in the form of a mobile equivalent for the corresponding nuclear weapons that would suit all interested parties. The question is a difficult one, and it would be naive to assume that it can be resolved in a short time. As any new matter, it requires a weighed, gradual approach and the requisite psychological reorientation. The French side agreed to an exchange of views with the Soviet Union. The main thing today is, having taken the first step, to embark upon the road leading to reduced nuclear confrontation on the European continent and in the world as a whole.

The General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee declared to the public that the SS-20 missiles, which the USSR has on standing alert in the European zone, now number 243 units, i. e. exactly as many as there were in June 1984, and that the stationary installations for an additional deployment of such missiles taken off alert would be dismantled within the next two months.

The unprecedentedly broad nature of the Soviet initiatives evoked a surge of enthusiasm and activism among those who advocate peace and detente—in the fraternal socialist countries, the non-aligned and neutral states, the antiwar movement and the peace movement, and in realistically minded quarters—and there are quite a few of them—in the capitalist camp. They saw for themselves that the USSR, acting boldly and innovatively, fully carries out its duty as a great peace-loving power, and tests whether its Western partners are prepared to reciprocate. There are possibilities for preserving and strengthening peace, halting the arms buildup, and ushering in a new era in international cooperation, including on the global problems of the late 20th century. The Soviet proposals put the foes of detente before a difficult choice. The potential of the new proposals is geared to the long term.

While taking concrete steps to back up its goodwill and doing all in its power to halt the arms race, the Soviet Union is at the same time convinced that an improvement in the international situation can be achieved only

through the joint efforts of all states. What is necessary for this is a political dialogue and a desire to understand one another and extend areas of mutual understanding, and to take joint or parallel efforts toward preserving international peace and security. It is from this vantage point that the Soviet Union defined the tasks facing the summit-level meeting in Paris.

It is far from accidental that at the present-day turning point in world affairs a new stage of East-West dialogue is beginning between two European countries—the USSR and France. Europe is a continent where alongside the unique experience of fruitful and all-round cooperation there paradoxically exist mountains of death-dealing weapons stockpiled here which are targeted at one another. It is in the West European countries that concern over the intensifying nuclear threat and the carrying of the arms race into outer space is growing palpably. Finally, one cannot help noting the relations between the USSR and France which have become traditional over the past few decades and which have created an outstanding historic precedent having largely initiated the detente process.

Numerous provisions and ideas formulated in Soviet-French documents of the 60s and 70s were mirrored in the Final Act of the European Conference in Helsinki, the convocation and success of which were largely promoted by the USSR and France. And, for that matter, many specific steps to develop Soviet-French relations in a number of fields of the economy, science and technology, culture, health care, sport, etc., which were first undertaken by the two countries, have become part of the practice of East-West relations.

Of course, the impressive road which the two countries have travelled in recent years has not always been smooth. It has had its rough moments.

It is important, however, that usually reason, realism, restraint and the realisation of the advantage of long-term common interests over considerations of the moment have taken the upper hand. The visit of French President François Mitterrand to the Soviet Union last June and his meetings with the Soviet leaders once again demonstrated the vital interest of both sides in a top-level exchange of views and in the search for a solution to the tension in Europe and the world as a whole. The desire of the USSR and France to develop bilateral cooperation was also reaffirmed during the meeting this past March between General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and President Mitterrand.

The new Soviet-French summit in Paris, carrying on the finest traditions of the relations between the two countries, was held in a constructive and frank—in the positive sense of the word—atmosphere.

When the leaders of the USSR and France, the leaders of two great powers, meet the traditions of relations between which have a long history, they inevitably focus on questions on which the destiny of civilisation depends. That was the case this time also. The emphasis at the talks was placed on the prevention of an arms race in outer space and the cessation of the arms race on the Earth, the strengthening of European and international security and the restoration of mutual trust, the reviving of detente and the development of multifaceted mutually beneficial cooperation on the European continent.

During the discussion of these cardinal issues the Soviet side voiced the firm belief that the USSR and France, remaining faithful to their allied commitments and given all the differences in approaches to particular international problems, each from its end would do much to break the dangerous course of events and set in motion political dynamics opposite to that which in the first half of the 80s led to a worsening of conditions for the security of all European nations.

The recent visit demonstrated with absolute clarity that the building of goodneighbourly relations with Western Europe is an independent line of Soviet foreign policy. The Soviet Union is not at all inclined to viewing the entire set of East-West ties through the prism of Soviet-American relations. Quite the opposite: as was stated during the visit, the Soviet Union is in favour of a heightened role for Europe in world affairs in accordance with historical traditions, community of the destinies of the European peoples, and the economic and political potential and intellectual possibilities of European civilisation. The USSR is proposing to Europe a lasting peace, mutually beneficial cooperation, and the pooling of efforts to resolve crucial global problems common to the Europeans and to the whole of mankind. The Soviet proposal on the establishment of equitable relations between the

CMEA and the EEC, about dealing with the Ten as a political entity when it acts as such, is further corroboration of this.

The French side spoke out definitively for the revival of detente, with Europe's role being enhanced in this. The fact that the USSR and France, which in their time stood at the sources of detente, have again introduced this term into the political lexicon, is, of course, of vital importance.

Figuring prominently here was the theme of the inviolability of the European borders and the complete implementation of all the principles and provisions of the Helsinki Final Act.

An important place at the talks was taken by the discussion of problems dealing with outer space. It was stated that the Soviet Union and France are, by and large, close in their approaches to this cardinal problem. Both Moscow and Paris are against the turning of outer space into a new arena of military confrontation and are in favour of keeping it peaceful. Outer space should serve to strengthen peace and security, not become an additional source of the military threat. As to the ways of achieving this goal, here each of the sides proposes its own approach, based on its own analysis of the strategic situation.

Of great importance were the confirmation by the French leaders of France's negative attitude to the "strategic defense initiative" of the Washington Administration and their support for the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems of indefinite duration.

Paris received with interest the new Soviet initiative regarding international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space in the context of its non-militarisation. Possessing a powerful space potential, France, like the Soviet Union, has a vested interest in outer space—the common property of mankind—being used for peace and progress. The Soviet side made it clear that given the creation of a world space organisation proposed by the USSR, a number of the ideas earlier set forth by the French side could be utilised. This organisation itself could be accommodated in Paris.

During the discussion of the agenda of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe both sides expressed the view that it is imperative to step up the pace of the Conference's proceedings and go over to practical talks on drafting accords in order to complete the first stage of the deliberations of the Stockholm forum with concrete, weighty results before the next meeting of the member states of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe slated for November 1986 in Vienna.

During the talks both sides spoke out in favour of a ban on chemical weapons and the destruction of stockpiles thereof, and stepped-up preparatory work on the relevant international convention at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. Mikhail Gorbachev came out for the elaboration of an international accord on the non-proliferation of chemical weapons, which would proceed along the general line of efforts for their complete prohibi-

tion, and supported the idea of the GDR and Czechoslovak governments on the creation in Central Europe of a zone free of chemical weapons.

The discussion of regional conflicts showed that there are close or coinciding elements in the stands of the two sides. Both the Soviet Union and France are agreed that urgent measures must be taken for a peaceful settlement in the "volatile areas" of the planet, without interference from without in the internal affairs of sovereign states.

Mention was made in a number of instances of the commonality both of the two sides' assessment of the situation and of a choice of ways of improving the situation in a particular part of the globe. Specifically, in their assessment of the situation in the Middle East the sides spoke in favour of preparations for the convocation of an appropriate international conference (with the participation of the USSR and France), which can really open the way to an all-embracing just settlement in this region.

Pointing to the on-going explosive situation in Central America, the sides voiced their support for the efforts of the states of the Contadora Group in favour of a political settlement of the situation in the region.

France has taken a more decisive stand than other Western countries vis-à-vis South Africa, having imposed partial sanctions against it. However, the developments, specifically the recent aggression perpetrated by the Pretoria regime against Angola, have shown the need for more decisive actions to force the South Africa to comply with the Security Council resolutions, lift the state of emergency, and free all political prisoners.

The consultations between the USSR and France on various regional problems will be continued.

The discussion of issues of bilateral Soviet-French relations was held in Paris with an eye to extending them and raising them to a qualitatively higher level that would take into account both the positive experience of the past and the objective needs of the future. Emphasis was placed on deepening a Soviet-French political dialogue for the sake of expanding the spheres of mutual understanding and cooperation on the main international problems. The sides stated that the present legal base of the political cooperation between the two countries is the underpinnings on which contacts on different levels could continue to develop successfully. The practice of consultations between the foreign policy departments of the two countries was given a high assessment, and mutual interest in continuing them on a regular basis was expressed.

A special role is played by top-level Soviet-French meetings, which when necessary can be supplemented by working meetings. On behalf of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Mikhail Gorbachev extended to French President François Mitterrand an invitation to visit the USSR. This invitation was accepted with gratitude; it was noted that the visit could take place as early as 1986. This again puts on the agenda of Soviet-French relations regularity of summit meetings.

In their examination of the state of affairs in economic, scientific and technological relations the sides expressed satisfaction with their development in recent years. In the 1980-1984 period, the trade turnover between the two countries, amounted, in absolute figures, to some 20,000 million rubles, more than doubling the volume of trade over the previous five-year span. The measures undertaken of late by the Soviet side have promoted a balance in trade exchange between the two countries.

The Soviet side expressed a readiness to further boost the commodity turnover between the two countries by approximately 33 per cent within the next few years. It was stressed that the Soviet Union intends to purchase from France only the latest technology and equipment.

The Agreement on Economic Cooperation between the two countries for the 1986-1990 period that was signed during the visit is designed to play a substantial role in the development of trade between the USSR and France.

As to cooperation in science and technology, which is developing in various fields on more than 300 themes, the wish was expressed that they be concentrated in areas determining scientific and technological progress. Attention was called to the fact that the efforts being taken by France together with its West European allies to develop advanced spheres of science and technology are in accord with the efforts of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. This opens up avenues for cooperation in the above-mentioned fields. Both sides gave a high assessment to the many years of Soviet-French cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space and expressed a desire for its continued development in various spheres, including the arrangement of a new joint lengthy space flight on a Soviet orbital station.

The project for cooperation on the construction of the international Tokamak thermonuclear reactor for obtaining energy on the basis of thermonuclear synthesis is highly promising. François Mitterrand took a positive attitude to this Soviet proposal.

The visit confirmed the readiness of the USSR and France for cooperation in the broad spectrum of fields which have come to be called the humanities, and for the expansion of mutually-enriching cultural exchanges reflecting the traditional interest of the two peoples.

On the whole, the visit led to positive shifts in Soviet-French ties in all spheres. The meetings and talks in Paris confirmed the fact that despite differences in approaches to a number of international problems, the areas of agreement existing between the two countries on the issues of preserving peace and strategic stability, and preventing an arms race in space enable the Soviet Union and France to cooperate in the international arena for the sake of eliminating the threat of nuclear war and strengthening European and world security.

In the broader sense the Soviet-French meeting in Paris inaugurated a new stage of dialogue not only between the USSR and France and Western Europe, but between East and West on the whole.

At the talks and in his public speeches, Mikhail Gorbachev, advancing the new Soviet peace initiatives not only before Frenchmen but before all West Europeans and the whole world, convincingly demonstrated the Soviet Union's readiness to conduct a joint search for ways to halt the arms race, reduce military confrontation, and effect a shift to normal relations based on peace, detente and international cooperation. On the part of the French side, and, judging by the reaction to the visit, in other West European states this readiness of the USSR generally met a positive response.

This gives reason to hope that the alienation between East and West which has grown of late is close to its limit and that there is an opportunity for breaking the current unfavourable development of the world situation.

The visit of Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Member of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, clearly showed that the USSR continues and develops its peace offensive. Furthermore, it can be said that a breakthrough of sorts in this offensive has been made. The political picture in Europe and the world as a whole is not the same it was prior to the visit. The peaceable foreign policy of the Soviet Union, which is being pursued intelligently and vigorously, the USSR's constructive course, which is imbued with a realisation of historical responsibility for the destinies of its own and other peoples, are drawing to this country and its leaders the attention and sympathies of millions of people.

The results of the visit, stressed the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, laid a good foundation for the further development of amicable relations between the Soviet Union and France and are of great importance for the strengthening of European security and extension of European security. The major Soviet proposals aimed at preventing the militarisation of outer space, curbing the race in nuclear and other armaments, and developing fruitful international cooperation in Europe and the world as a whole amply demonstrated the peaceable foreign policy course of the Soviet state.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1985

English Translation Progress Publishers 1985

/9317

CSO: 5200/1253

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS: U.S. STRATEGY USES EUROPE AS NUCLEAR BUFFER

LD121750 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1615 GMT 12 Feb 86

["Why Does the Pentagon Need Nuclear Missiles in Europe?"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 12 Feb -- TASS observer on military questions Vladimir Bogachev writes:

Pentagon representatives recently assured the world public that the present U.S. Administration was prepared to destroy "a whole class of medium-range missile weapons." But now they are stating that adoption by the United States of the Soviet proposal for the total elimination of these same Soviet and U.S. missiles in the European zone is "undesirable." To be more precise, the U.S. military leaders are not against the destruction of all Soviet medium-range missiles, and not just in Europe, but they categorically object to the simultaneous elimination of U.S. "Pershings" and cruise missiles in the FRG, Britain, and in the other European NATO countries.

In an interview with the West German newspaper NEUE OSNABRUECKER ZEITUNG, U.S. General Bernard Rogers, commander in chief of NATO troops in Europe, stated that the United States must keep its "Pershing" and cruise missiles on the European Continent as they "are a connecting link between European and U.S. security." Rogers went on to assert that the mutual elimination of U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in the European zone would be disadvantageous for NATO. According to him, Soviet SS-20 missiles "could reach Europe from the other side of the Urals, too." While the United States, you see, would not have medium-range nuclear weapons capable of reaching Soviet territory. The general is clearly pretending to be an ill-informed simpleton, while attempting to denigrate, using every means, the very idea of any reductions or even limitations in U.S. nuclear armaments in Western Europe, which are so dear to his heart.

While describing the advancement of the Soviet proposals as "a positive factor," Rogers at once resorts to the crudest distortions of the true state of affairs in Europe and of the essence of the Soviet initiatives on medium-range missiles.

The Soviet proposal provides for the elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles, not within the geographical framework of Europe, but in the European zone which stretches from the Atlantic Ocean in the west and, in the east, far beyond the Urals, right up to the line from which Soviet medium-range missiles would not be able to reach targets in Western Europe.

Washington's objections to a mutual reduction in the Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone are not at all caused by considerations of "the linkage of U.S. and West European security." The point is that the Pentagon does not like

any measures that contribute to the normalization of the military-political situation on the European Continent, nor does it like agreements that might strengthen the security of all European countries or raise obstacles to U.S. plans for the attainment of military superiority.

U.S. military strategy places the main emphasis on preparations for a "limited" nuclear war in Europe -- at a significant distance from U.S. shores. According to this strategy, it is the Europeans who must pay, first and foremost, for U.S. military adventures. U.S. "Pershings" and cruise missiles are intended to become the main instrument of this strategy.

It is precisely for this reason Rogers is insisting on keeping U.S. medium-range missiles in Western Europe.

/8309

CS0: 5200/1261

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SOVIET ARMY PAPER: 'EUROPEAN ASPECT' VITAL TO DISARMAMENT

PM101207 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[Candidate of Military Sciences Major General (Reserve) F. Gontar article under the rubric "Military Scientists' Opinion": "Cutting the Gordian Knot; European Aspect of the Nuclear Problem"]

[Text] The 15 January statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, put forward a range of principled foreign policy initiatives aimed at ending the nuclear arms race on earth, preventing it in space, and building trust as an inalienable component of relations among states.

The core of the Soviet proposals is a specific program running up to the end of this century for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons worldwide. The problem of eliminating nuclear weapons in Europe has an important place in this program. This is conditioned by the fact that major groupings of NATO and Warsaw Pact troops equipped with medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons are concentrated there. On the European Continent the United States alone, not counting Britain and France, has over 7,000 nuclear charges. The bulk of them (more than 5,000 units) are sited in the FRG.

Contrary to the European peoples' security interests and commonsense arguments, 108 U.S. Pershing-2 medium-range nuclear ballistic missile launchers were hurriedly deployed in the FRG at the end of last year. Series production of these missiles (on the basis of three units for each launcher) is continuing in the United States on Pentagon orders.

As things stood at the end of last year 96 U.S. nuclear ground-launched cruise missiles [GLCM] had been deployed in Britain, 32 in Italy, and 16 in Belgium. The first of the 96 missiles, whose deployment was previously planned to begin only in 1987, have been shipped to the FRG from overseas.

In all, the Pentagon plans to site 464 nuclear GLCM's in the West European NATO countries by the end of 1988. And this despite the fact that the territory of the West European countries is already literally chockablock with nuclear weapons and has been turned into an enormous nuclear powder keg. Their elimination is a prime task in strengthening not only European, but international security.

In order to prevent a further raising of the level of nuclear missile confrontation in Europe, the Soviet Union proposed -- during the new Soviet-U.S. talks last March -- the declaration of a joint moratorium on the deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe.

However, the U.S. side refused to accept this moratorium on farfetched pretexts. Yet the Soviet Union, showing good will, reinforced its proposal with unilateral action, ending the deployment of medium-range missiles and the buildup of other retaliatory measures in Europe as of April 1985. The continuing siting of U.S. missiles in the West European countries can only complicate the implementation of the joint accord on accelerating work at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms.

The fact that militarist U.S. and NATO circles are blocking in every possible way the constructive resolution of the problem of lowering the level of nuclear missile confrontation in Europe is attested by a number of facts.

Speaking at the December (1985) NATO defense minister's session, Pentagon chief C. Weinberger announced the U.S. Senate decision to allocate \$200 million for the construction in West European countries of the necessary infrastructure to expedite the continued deployment of U.S. nuclear GLCM's on their territories. This shows that the Pentagon is planning to dig in long and hard on the European Continent with its first-strike missiles.

The accelerated deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe is of exceptional concern to the European peoples. They recognize that these missiles are one of the most dangerous factors destabilizing the military-political situation and raising the nuclear confrontation level on the continent. This problem has been discussed for many years now. Meanwhile, security conditions in Europe continue to worsen. It is time to stop this development of events and cut this Gordian knot.

In order to improve the situation in Europe, reduce the threshold of military confrontation, and remove the risk of the outbreak of war in the region, the Soviet Union proposes in the first phase to implement its program, that is, to take the first radical step over the next 5-8 years, starting in 1986. In this phase a decision on the complete elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles -- both ballistic and cruise -- in the European zone will be reached and implemented. This will require the development of appropriate procedures which will stipulate the amounts, timetables, and places in which these missiles will be destroyed and the means for reliable, including international, on-site verification [kontrol] and inspection [inspektaiya]. The United States must pledge not to ship its strategic and medium-range missiles to other countries and Britain and France must pledge not to build up their corresponding nuclear arms. And if the first phase of nuclear disarmament applies to the Soviet Union and the United States, this is merely because -- as the U.S. side stated at the Geneva summit -- they must set a good example to the other nuclear powers.

It is striking that the mass media in the United States and certain other NATO countries are claiming that the Soviet proposals on medium-range missiles in Europe repeat the "zero option" once put forward by the U.S. President. This is deliberate disinformation. Reagan's "zero option" envisaged that the Soviet Union would have to destroy its medium-range missiles not only in the European zone, but in the east of the country. Moreover, it did not rule out the possibility of the American's transferring medium-range missiles to their allies and building up the corresponding arms of Britain and France. Thus, the U.S.-style "zero option" and the Soviet proposal for the complete elimination of U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in the European zone have nothing in common. The Soviet proposal is a great and bold step along the road of completely ridding the continent of nuclear weapons without damaging either side's security interests.

In the second phase, which will start not later than 1990 and last for 5-7 years, the other nuclear powers, including Britain and France, will join in the nuclear disarmament process.

Initially, they would pledge to freeze their nuclear arms and not to hold any on the territories of other countries. In this period the Soviet Union and the United States would continue the reductions agreed on in the first phase and implement further measures to eliminate their medium-range nuclear arms while simultaneously freezing their tactical nuclear means everywhere.

This nuclear arms reduction procedure is proposed on the basis that British, French, and Chinese leaders have repeatedly stated that their countries would be prepared to join in the nuclear disarmament process only when the Soviet Union and the United States substantially reduced their nuclear arsenals. That is why the Soviet plan envisages that the other countries with these weapons would embark on nuclear disarmament in the second phase, after the Soviet Union and the United States reduced the nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territories; not just substantially, but by 50 percent. Moreover, according to the Soviet proposal the reduction of our countries' nuclear arsenals would begin with the destruction of tactical nuclear weapons, while those arms which they themselves call strategic would be destroyed only in the third phase (1995-1999), with the elimination of the Soviet and U.S. nuclear arsenals being completed simultaneously.

The Soviet proposal to eliminate medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe has clearly annoyed Pentagon strategists. Striving at all costs to weaken its attraction, they are issuing various fabrications. They claim, for instance, that the Soviet Union, having scrapped its medium-range missiles in the European zone, could rapidly transfer medium-range missiles there from the Asian part of the country. But, first, Soviet medium-range missiles are not in the east to be transported hither and thither, but primarily, because the United States has nuclear means capable of reaching Soviet territory in that region. And second, if I may put the question to the authors of this "argument," how much time would the Pentagon need to transfer Pershing-2's from the United States to Europe using transport aircraft? So there is no logic in this type of "proof." We are faced merely with a desire to bring the resolution of such an important question for security in Europe to a standstill on any pretext.

In the West people are discussing the question of whether the Soviet-U.S. accord reached at the Geneva summit on a mutually binding solution to the problem of nuclear and space arms remains in force. The Soviet Union, as follows from M.S. Gorbachev's statement, firmly proceeds on the basis that the reduction and subsequent elimination of nuclear arms are only possible given a joint Soviet and U.S. refusal to create [sozdaniye], test, and deploy space strike arms. This is not an arbitrary linkage of two different questions. It is a question of their objective, organic, and material interconnection, which cannot be severed. Instead of spending immense resources on creating [sozdaniye] space strike arms that are extremely dangerous to mankind and which could allegedly make nuclear weapons unnecessary, is it not more sensible to destroy and ultimately, eliminate nuclear weapons? Our country is proposing just such a course.

It should be stressed that the Soviet program attaches great importance to the problem of ending nuclear tests. That is why the Soviet Union has extended its moratorium on all nuclear explosions through 31 March this year and urged the United States to join the moratorium. A complete and universal ban on nuclear weapons tests would be an important practical step toward their elimination.

Speaking of the importance of the European aspect of the nuclear problem, M.S. Gorbachev stressed: "If it were possible, without stalling or burdening the work with other problems, to eliminate Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles on our continent, we would probably have unraveled one of the complex knots of current world politics and cleared the way considerably for a radical reduction in nuclear weapons and subsequently, their complete elimination." Therein lies the essence of the USSR's constructive position.

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS: INF ACCORD POSSIBLE WITHOUT SPACE ARMS CONNECTION

LD071548 Moscow TASS in English 1450 GMT 7 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 7 TASS — TASS commentator Vasily Kharkov writes: The new Soviet proposal concerning medium-range missiles, which is part of the Soviet Union's comprehensive program for ridding mankind of the nuclear threat, has evoked particularly broad response in Europe.

The Soviet Union's readiness to eliminate its medium-range missiles in the European zone if such missiles are eliminated also by the United States is a first step to delivering the continent from nuclear weapons.

It will not be an exaggeration to say that there is now every possibility to reach agreement on this problem. The only thing needed is the political will of the other side, that is the United States.

Talking with U.S. Senator Edward Kennedy Thursday Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev gave a further explanation of the Soviet position, which undoubtedly can make it easier to come to terms. He said that the Soviet proposal on the elimination of all Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone, just as the proposal for an end to nuclear explosions, is not accompanied by any conditions, except for Britain's and France's pledge not to build up their corresponding nuclear arms and for the U.S. to undertake not to transfer such weapons to their countries.

It can be concluded from this that an agreement on medium-range missiles can be reached without a connection with the problem of space and strategic arms. The only thing needed is for the United States to make a commitment not to supply its strategic missiles and medium-range missiles to other countries and for Britain and France to refrain from beefing up their corresponding nuclear arsenals. Britain and France will join the process of nuclear disarmament later, when all nuclear powers reduce their tactical nuclear systems.

The Soviet Union maintains a consistent course aimed at liberating Europe from nuclear weapons, but the so-called program for NATO's nuclear re-armament, which has been imposed by Washington, has led to a situation where hundreds of American Pershing-2 and cruise missiles are now on station in several West European countries. Deliveries of such first-strike weapons to Western Europe are continuing, which is only aggravating tension even further.

The new Soviet initiative on medium-range missiles opens up great possibilities. "If we managed to eliminate the Soviet and American medium-range missiles on our continent without delay or burdening the matter with other problems," said Mikhail Gorbachev, "we would unravel what is perhaps one of the complicated tangles in present-day world politics and would significantly clear the way toward a radical reduction in nuclear weapons and eventually to complete elimination thereof."

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS: U.S. OFFICIALS 'CAMOUFLAGE' 'OBSTRUCTIONIST STAND'

LD151816 Moscow TASS in English 1752 GMT 15 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 15 TASS — Vladimir Bogachev, TASS military news analyst, writes:

In their public statements, high-ranking representatives of the U.S. Administration "welcome" the new proposals on nuclear disarmament put forward by the Soviet Union, including also on medium-range missiles. Even American general Bernard Rogers, the NATO allied commander in Europe, described them as a "positive fact" in his interview with the newspaper *NEUE OSNABRUECKER ZEITUNG*. As the Belgian news agency said, Paul Nitze, U.S. presidential consultant, stressed during his meetings in Brussels, that there now exists a possibility to reach a Soviet-American agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe.

As is known, the Soviet Union proposed as the first step on the way of ridding the European Continent of nuclear weapons that Soviet and American medium-range missiles in the European zone be completely eliminated. In so doing the USA should commit itself not to supply its strategic and medium-range missiles to other countries, while Britain and France -- should not build up their respective weapons.

The newspaper *WASHINGTON POST* said that at a meeting at the U.S. State Department, presidential advisors proposed that instead of complete elimination of Soviet and American medium-range missiles in the European zone, as is proposed by the Soviet Union, a part of such missiles be preserved in Europe, while unilateral reductions of Soviet SS-20 be carried out in Asia. They claim that Washington will not accept the Soviet terms for a freeze on the British and French nuclear forces and will insist on the right of the USA to turn over American sea-based Trident-2 missiles to London.

One cannot help asking the question what the presidential advisors propose to leave of the Soviet proposal on the medium-range missiles in the European zone, which they "welcome" by word of mouth? Practically nothing.

There is an impression, that some U.S. Administration officials, who do not dare to reject openly the Soviet initiatives, which have ardent support of the world public, are forced to maneuver, to camouflage their obstructionist stand on the disarmament problems. "Disarmament proposals have been recently coming from Moscow, which cause fear even in U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger," says the West German newspaper *FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU*. It looks like they arouse fear not only in Weinberger.

In order to reject in a highly diplomatic manner a positive proposal of the other side, it is necessary to agree with it in principle, but reject in essence, the architects of the English school of diplomacy of the 19th century lectured. Some Washington officials have, apparently, decided to follow this obsolete rule.

The European aspect of the nuclear problem has been a subject of discussion for many years now, while the security conditions in Europe continue deteriorating. The Soviet Union proposes to put an end to such developments, to cut this Gordian knot and rid Europe both of the medium-range nuclear weapons and tactical ones. It is absolutely obvious that the implementation of the Soviet initiatives cannot be detrimental to any country either in Europe, or, the more so, in America.

The world public has the right to expect that common sense will prevail in Washington, that the U.S. reply to the Soviet initiatives, including on medium-range missiles, will be based on the true interests of strengthening security in all countries without exception.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1261

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA ON FRG 'RELUCTANCE' TO DISARM

PM061013 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 Feb 86 First Edition p 1

[APN correspondent V. Markov article for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA under the rubric "Into the 21st Century Without Nuclear Weapons!": "Contradictions on the Rhine"]

[Excerpt] The "Presse Haus" is in the government district of the capital on the Rhine. The press centers of the German and foreign mass media are housed in that six-storied building here. Bonn Cabinet spokesmen hold press conferences in the expansive hall. This time there were more correspondents than usual.

"The Federal Government believes that the Soviet proposals contain constructive new elements on the problem of verification [kontrol] in various spheres of disarmament and of regulation and estimation regarding medium-range systems," F. Ost, leader of the press department, said, reading from a prepared text.

He listed not only those provisions of the Soviet initiative which Bonn considers positive but also a "number of items which it cannot approve." The official government spokesman did not say a word about the USSR's decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions by 3 months. Whereas before the Federal Government cited the "problem of the verification" [kontrol] of the observance of the moratorium, now, as F. Ost himself has just admitted, such a "justification" is completely inappropriate.

"What is the Federal Republic's position on the nuclear test moratorium?"

F. Ost said that he did not want to repeat what had been said recently on that question. This was a clear reference to Chancellor H. Kohl's statement but surely, there too, the stress was on verification [kontrol]... For all intents and purposes there has been no positive reaction from Bonn to the unilateral Soviet moratorium. Furthermore, L. Ruehl, secretary of state at the FRG Defense Ministry, stated outright the other day that a "limited number of nuclear weapons tests remain necessary."

Is Bonn prepared for nuclear disarmament and the world's complete liberation from the burden of nuclear arsenals? It would not be out of place to put this fundamental question to the Government of the FRG, the only country where Pershing-2's, the U.S. first strike nuclear missiles, are being deployed. Furthermore, the FRG now has on its soil what is already seen to be the highest concentration of armaments -- both nuclear and conventional -- in the world.

"We must not put ourselves in the position of people who refuse to abandon nuclear weapons at a time when Moscow is proposing nuclear disarmament," V. Ruehe, deputy chairman of the Christian Democratic Union-Christian Social Union's Bundestag faction, warns.

This is perfectly justified alarm which, by the way, sheds light on why official Bonn was not pleased that the Soviet proposals have been made known to the international public at large. Its reluctance to engage immediately in real disarmament is only too obvious.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1261

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

PRAVDA: DUTCH LABOR PARTY VOTES AGAINST CRUISE MISSILES

PH191116 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondent Yu. Kharlanov dispatch: "Against the Arms Race; Extraordinary Congress of Netherlands Labor Party"]

[Text] Amsterdam, 17 Feb -- An extraordinary congress of the Labor Party -- the country's main opposition party -- has been at work for 3 days in the Netherlands capital. The agenda included the question of the Netherlands socialists' program and tactics in the campaign for the May parliamentary elections.

During the discussion the question was posed whether the Labor Party should relax its categorically negative attitude to the stationing of U.S. cruise missiles on Netherlands soil with a view to the socialists' possible participation in a coalition government after the elections. However, most of the speakers resolutely opposed this. The delegates recalled that recent polls have shown that 84 percent of those who vote socialist insist that the Labor Party continue to take a hard line on this problem. During a special vote, a decision to demand that the Netherlands refuse to accept cruise missiles was adopted.

The election program adopted at the congress says that the Labor Party opposes the arms race, primarily the nuclear missile arms race. Netherlands socialists advocate declaring the European continent a nuclear-free zone.

Delivering the closing speech at the congress, Labor Party leader J. den Uyl said that the USSR's recent proposals on nuclear disarmament issues are vitally important for all countries and primarily for the European states. What arguments, he exclaimed, do those who cling to the decision to accept U.S. cruise missiles on Netherlands soil have left?

In conversation with this PRAVDA correspondent K. de Vries, a Labor Party deputy to the Netherlands Parliament, welcomed the USSR's proposals on the total elimination of all medium-range nuclear missiles in the European zone. It is a realistic and feasible proposal, he said, which must be implemented immediately. All the European peoples, who realize that weapons of this kind are a destabilizing factor that do not increase but, on the contrary, reduce the level of security of those countries where they are located, have an interest in it.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1261

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SOVIET ENVOYS OUTLINE SOVIET POSITION ON EUROPEAN MISSILES

LD121834 Stockholm Domestic Service in Swedish 1700 GMT 12 Feb 86

[Text] [Announcer] The possibilities of reaching an agreement on nuclear disarmament in Europe now seem to be brighter than they were for a long time. The Soviet Union has relinquished its earlier demands for an agreement with the United States on medium-range missiles in Europe. This was made clear by specially sent envoys from Moscow at a press conference at the Soviet Embassy in Stockholm today.

[Correspondent Gueran Skaansberg] At the press conference at the Soviet Embassy today it was confirmed very definitely that the Soviet Union no longer sets the same conditions as earlier for an agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe. Earlier it was (?demanded) that the United States should end all research and development on space weapons, the so-called "star wars," in order that there should be, on the whole, an agreement on other weapons. This is not demanded now.

The proposal to withdraw the U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe, which was presented by party leader Gorbachev a month ago and which is part of Gorbachev's program for dismantling all nuclear weapons by the year 2000 is not in itself linked with (?the demand) concerning the U.S. space weapons. This was made quite clear by Moscow's envoys at the press conference at the Soviet Embassy today.

The Soviet leadership is not making the same linkage now, between its own medium-range missiles and the British and French nuclear weapons. The only conditions set here is that Great Britain and France must not increase their nuclear weapons arsenals.

This signifies an entirely new Soviet attitude. It coincides largely with the so-called zero option, which President Reagan proposed in 1981 and which consisted of the United States refraining from the deployment of new missiles in Western Europe if the Soviet Union in return withdrew its SS-20 missiles. Reagan (?has already) responded positively to the Soviet proposal. He did this in an interview on Monday [10 February] when Senator Edward Kennedy, following his visit to Moscow, conveyed the new lines of thought there.

The fact that the Soviet Union is now sending special envoys to West European countries, including Sweden, to present more concisely the [words indistinct] in Gorbachev's disarmament proposals shows how seriously they view the possibilities of getting somewhere in the disarmament talks between the superpowers. But even if the signals are now more positive than they were for a long time, this is a process that will take a very long time and which can easily turn to disappointment. This is a lesson the peoples in Europe have learned by now.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1261

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR'S CHERVOV, MIKHAYLOV DELINEATE SOVIET STANDS

LD111350 Hamburg DPA in German 1309 GMT 11 Feb 86

[Text] Berlin/Bonn, 11 Feb (DPA) -- The Soviet Union is allegedly prepared to destroy all of its medium-range missiles targeted on Western Europe, if NATO is prepared for a similar step. "We do not intend to deploy these missiles in some other place. They will be destroyed under careful and reliable national and international inspection, including on-site inspections," Colonel General Nikolay F. Chervov, department chief of the Soviet General Staff, said during a television press conference of Sender Freies Berlin, to be televised on ARD Television tomorrow.

"There will be no traps, no obstacles, no deception," the high-ranking general staff officer said. Furthermore, Chervov who had come specially to the SFB studio, said, not only the medium-range missiles, but also the launching pads and relevant infrastructure would be removed.

Soviet Army Admits Space Research

The Soviet side has not admitted publicly that it also conducts research in the area of military space weapons and has relevant laboratories. In an interview with the military journal LOYAL to be published tomorrow the spokesman of the General Staff of the Soviet Army, Lieutenant General Konstantin Mikhaylov, said that his country conducts research in the area of "cosmic reconnaissance, navigation, and communications" and will continue to perfect this. There is, however, no similarity between this research and the U.S. SDI project. "We have no programs for the creation of offensive space weapons," the Soviet general said.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1261

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

BRIEFS

TASS NOTES TOMAHAWK TRIAL--Washington, 16 Feb (TASS)--A representative of the U.S. Department of the Navy has announced that a trial launch of a Tomahawk cruise missile, capable of carrying a nuclear warhead, took place Saturday in the area of the Florida coast. The Pentagon is equipping both submarine and surface vessels of the U.S. Navy with Tomahawks. They have been installed on 20 vessels already at present. The program to develop [razvertyvaniye] land- and air-based cruise missiles is also being carried out in the United States at full speed. The Pentagon is laying no small stake on this type of first-strike weapon in its attempts to disrupt military-strategic parity with the Soviet Union, while pushing the arms race further on. [Text] [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0004 GMT 16 Feb 86] /8309

CSO: 5200/1261

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

SOVIET JOURNAL ON RESULTS OF FALL 1985 CD SESSION

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 12, Dec 85 pp 35-40, 48

[Article by V. Levonov, D.Sc. (Hist.): "The Results of the 1985 Session of the Conference on Disarmament"]

[Text] From early February till the end of August 1985, with a short break, the annual 23rd Session of the Conference on Disarmament was held in Geneva.¹ This is the only multilateral body for negotiating the disarmament problems on a global scale, and its significance is enhanced by the participation in recent years in the Conference's proceedings of all nuclear powers and the main political forces of our time. All this not only reflects the considerable possibilities of the Conference, but also places particular demands on it. Of course, the scope of these possibilities depends on the international situation and the foreign policies of the participating states. The Geneva forum is a barometre measuring the impact made by these factors. However, equally true is that there is a feedback: by resolving the urgent disarmament issues the Conference can and should make its contribution to the shaping of the world politics and the process of limiting and reducing armaments.

How were these objectively interrelated factors reflected in the course and results of the 1985 Session of the Conference on Disarmament?

The Session was held amidst a difficult and tense situation in the world. The sources of this are quite obvious. First of all it is the US drive to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union and its allies, the drive which is whipping up the unprecedented arms race and bringing it to a qualitatively new stage fraught with processes beyond anybody's control. The situation is further exacerbated by the fact that the instigators and protagonists of this drive, prominent in US foreign policy, have actually undermined disarmament, and even arms limitation.

As a result of the unabating efforts of the socialist and non-aligned countries, the Conference on Disarmament, at last, in 1985, started to examine one of the most pressing issues of our time—the prevention of an arms race in outer space. The discussion of this issue at the plenary meetings and within the framework of a newly-established special committee vividly confirmed a wide-spread realisation of the tremendous danger of the arms race spilling into outer space. Practically all the participants in the Conference, except the USA, voiced their concern over the

¹ The Geneva Committee on Disarmament, renamed in 1984.

fact that the realisation of the so-called "strategic defense initiative" would entail irreparable consequences for the destinies of mankind. This was indicated by the delegations of the socialist countries, representatives of India, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Australia and other states.

Proposals contained in a working document submitted by a group of socialist countries laid the groundwork for the activities of the special committee. The discussion in the committee began with an all-round examination of the problem of various long-range consequences—political, military, economic and others—that would follow as a result of the creation of a new class of weapons—attack space-based weapons. The most important military-strategic consequences were analysed with particular thoroughness. Most of the participants believed that such a turn of events would accelerate the arms race in all fields, including strategic weapons, which, in turn, would multiply military stockpiles, change the structure of the armed forces, sharply raise the level of military confrontation, increase the probability of a nuclear war breaking out, and would undermine the strategic stability. The area where crisis situations may arise would expand considerably, also as a result of a wrong interpretation of the situation, individual incidents and technical mishaps.

It was also pointed out at the Conference that the spread of the arms race into outer space disorganises the process and methods of negotiations on disarmament, and will undermine the prospects for limiting and reducing armaments as a whole.

The Conference also examined the existing international agreements connected with the limitation of military activities in outer space, and aired views on their role in preventing an arms race in outer space.

The proposals on averting an arms race in outer space were also discussed. In particular, the Conference examined the USSR's proposals on concluding a treaty on the prohibition of deploying weapons of any kind in outer space (1981), on signing a treaty on the prohibition of the use of force in outer space and from outer space with regard to Earth (1983), a treaty on the use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes, for the benefit of mankind (1984), and a number of proposals made by other countries.

The reply of Mikhail Gorbachev to the Appeal of the Union of Concerned Scientists, which was circulated as an official document of the Conference, drew great attention among its participants. They also displayed great interest in the Soviet proposal to include on the agenda of the 40th UN General Assembly Session an item on International Cooperation in Peaceful Exploration of Outer Space in Conditions of Its Non-Militarisation. The Soviet proposal was immediately christened a programme of "star peace", which the Soviet Union counterpoised to the US plans of waging "star wars".

In its summary report the Conference noted the importance and urgency of preventing an arms race in outer space, as well as the necessity to continue the work on this issue at its next session.

The Conference made certain progress in the negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons. Academic discussions and abstract deliberations, which the USA and its allies tried to impose on the Conference, gave way to a concrete specification and formulation, albeit only most preliminary in nature, of some provisions of a future convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons.

The final document of the Conference reflects the provisions of the convention on which the views of the participants in the talks (about 50 states, with some of them being observers) converge or coincide, as well as provisions on which they differ noticeably.

The Conference could have made a more tangible progress in the elaboration of a draft convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons, with all prerequisites being there to do so. However, the decision of the US Administration to launch the production of binary chemical weapons seriously hurt the talks.

The participants in the Geneva multilateral forum, the Soviet Union above all, countered the obstructionist US stand with determination to unswervingly pursue the goal of prohibiting and eliminating all types of chemical weapons and speed up the conclusion of a relevant convention.

This year the Conference on Disarmament also managed considerably to invigorate its activity concerned with the elaboration of a comprehensive programme on disarmament. The First Special UN General Assembly Session Devoted to Disarmament held in 1978 took a decision to elaborate this programme, which is called upon to map out a stage-by-stage implementation of the most extensive range of disarmament measures. Although a set of new important provisions of a future programme was agreed upon, still, there were no grounds for complete satisfaction, since the Conference could have done immeasurably more if all the participating countries had displayed a willingness to do so. The conclusion of the work on the above programme has become an important task facing the Conference.

The talks on the prohibition of radiological weapons and the protection of nuclear facilities from attacks have become more vigorous and purposeful than previously. The progress made in this field was mainly due to the enterprising and constructive stand of the socialist countries submitting a working document, which, among other things, proposed that the nuclear installations under the IAEA safeguards should be covered by such protection. These countries took a number of other steps to meet their partners in the talks half way. The socialist countries also declared that, while favouring a problem-by-problem approach to the prohibition of radiological weapons and the prohibition of attacks on nuclear installations, they were prepared for a package settlement. An ad hoc committee on the prohibition of radiological weapons began to coordinate the wording of individual provisions of a future agreement or agreements. However, a step forward could have been made in this field as well, if most of the participants did not encounter the unyielding and, moreover, hardline position of some states, including those which do not participate in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, states striving to incorporate in a treaty on the prohibition of radiological weapons provisions detrimental to the non-proliferation regime.

In the course of the deliberations on the prohibition of new types and systems of mass destruction weapons the Soviet delegation submitted a new proposal to the Conference. It provides that all the states participating in the Conference should agree—in a joint declaration or unilaterally—to start negotiations on the prohibition of new types of mass destruction weapons and simultaneously declare a moratorium on their practical development as soon as this or that type of such weapons appears. The task of revealing and identifying new mass destruction weapons would be entrusted to a group of experts who would periodically come together and supervise these issues, making pertinent recommendations on questions which should be subjects of specific negotiations. This proposal met with wide approval.

The belated creation of an auxiliary body for strengthening the security of non-nuclear weapons states (negative safeguards) at the Conference's final stage did not allow the work of this body to unfold in full scale. However, consultations revealed that a considerable majority of

states (socialist and non-aligned) continue to attach great importance to this issue and are prepared to actively participate in a search for mutually acceptable solutions.

The Conference can be praised for the creation of its five auxiliary bodies—special committees—and the fruitful work of at least four of them.

The work of the Geneva multilateral forum could not but be affected by the counterpoising of the positive and negative trends in international relations. Washington's stake on military superiority, strong-arming and attempts to outplay its partners at the talks at the Conference on Disarmament and other international forums were a lever designed to block the negotiations for the sake of the unchecked and accelerated implementation of the US military programmes. This approach limited the results of the Session to a few shifts in some fields. It also excluded any progress in the most important, priority matters on the agenda—the prohibition of nuclear tests, the limitation of the nuclear arms race and the prevention of a nuclear war. For many years now the Conference has failed to begin concrete negotiations on these issues, mostly due to the obstructionist stand taken by the USA.

The Conference has been idle as regards examination of the urgent problem of the prohibition of nuclear weapons tests, this stagnation having been artificially created and now being preserved by the West. Over the past two years alone, the Western countries have torpedoed five times the possibility of reaching an accord on the beginning of negotiations in a Conference body set up specifically to draft an appropriate treaty. They resorted to a sort of veto in the examination of the powers of the special committee on the prohibition of nuclear tests, which were proposed by socialist and non-aligned countries on April 3, 1984; on July 26, 1984 (twice); and on March 21, 1985 (twice).

At the present Session, as at several previous ones, the Conference on Disarmament paid a great deal of attention to the problem of banning nuclear weapon tests. Many delegations, including the Soviet delegation, have spoken on this problem several times. The diversity of opinions expressed in the course of the debate calls for a number of conclusions, and the chief conclusion is that time is running out for solving the problem of banning nuclear weapons tests. That was the opinion of the overwhelming majority of the states represented at the Conference. A radical solution to this problem would be a ban on nuclear tests by everyone and everywhere, since only such a solution would erect a formidable barrier to the development and perfecting of new types and systems of nuclear weapons, thereby slowing down and bringing to naught the nuclear arms race.

Another important conclusion drawn in their speeches by many representatives is that there already exist the necessary prerequisites for the elaboration of the treaty. First of all, it is a draft of basic provisions of a treaty on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapons tests proposed by the Soviet Union in 1982 which reflected the degree of concord reached at the tripartite negotiations conducted by the USSR, the USA and Britain (1977-1980), and the attitude of a number of countries. This is a draft treaty on the prohibition of nuclear weapon tests proposed by the Swedish delegation. Finally, these prerequisites include the constructive considerations and proposals put forward as regards the essence of a treaty on the prohibition of nuclear weapons tests.

Another important conclusion made in the speeches of the majority of the delegates boils down to the fact that the far-too-long absence of a treaty can be explained by the lack of political will on the part of certain nuclear powers (primarily the USA, which has declared the conclusion of such a treaty a "long-range goal") to tackle the problem of the prohibition of tests in principle, rather than by the difficulties involved in its elaboration and the unsurmountable obstacles to elaborating a common verification procedure. Conviction was expressed at the Conference that a draft of a corresponding treaty could be agreed upon already at the current Session, provided there is a constructive approach to the problem. To achieve this, only one thing is needed—to cast aside far-fetched pretexts and to establish an auxiliary body and guide its efforts at the elaboration of a document, whose basic provisions, including verification, would be clear to everyone and thoroughly studied.

The new peaceful initiative of the Soviet Union which unilaterally stopped all nuclear explosions starting from August 6, 1985, was received at the Conference as a logical continuation of the Soviet Union's efforts aimed at securing a general and complete ban on nuclear weapon tests, as an open and honest position and a concrete, tangible measure.

The delegations of the socialist countries, as well as of India, Mexico, Pakistan, Burma and a number of other states used the Conference's rostrum to praise this step taken by the Soviet Union, voiced their support of the moratorium on nuclear weapon tests and called upon other nuclear powers to follow the USSR's good initiative by starting businesslike, concrete talks on banning nuclear weapon tests by everyone and everywhere.

Mikhail Gorbachev's replies to a TASS correspondent were circulated as an official document of the Conference on Disarmament on the day the moratorium came into force—August 6, 1985—the 40th anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, which was the starting point of the nuclear arms race.

The discussion at the Conference brought to the fore the fact that a discontinuation of nuclear weapon tests is a reliable way to reduce nuclear stockpiles and totally eliminate them; and that such a discontinuation will slow down the creation of new types of nuclear weapons, and will entail a quantitative reduction of nuclear components due to their obsolescence and eventual total disappearance. The Soviet Union's readiness to extend the moratorium, if the USA refrains from nuclear explosions, was met with a profound satisfaction at the Conference.

The reaction to the Soviet moratorium by a substantial majority of the states represented at the Conference is vividly confirmed by the provision of the summary report of the Conference included in it on the initiative of the delegations of the leading non-aligned countries to the effect that many delegations which did not belong to any particular alliance welcomed the decision of one major nuclear state to declare a moratorium on all nuclear explosions as of August 6, 1985. They declared that this decision precisely reflected what was specifically requested by the General Assembly in five resolutions running adopted annually since 1980. They stated with confidence that if any other major nuclear state took a similar decision, that would be a useful step, which could be crowned by the attainment of the goal of such long standing—a complete cessation of nuclear weapons tests.

The US delegation with lukewarm support on the part of some of its NATO allies, attempted to smear the clear-cut position of the USSR and resorted to ruses which Washington employed to avoid a constructive reply on the essence of the matter.

Speaking at the Conference, the US delegation attempted to portray the American proposal that the Soviet Union send its experts to attend nuclear tests at an American testing site as an important step helping discontinue these tests. This proposal did not meet with support (only one or two delegations of the Western countries attended), and it even failed to evoke any interest at the Conference. One should stop nuclear tests, not invite others to watch them—such was the opinion of the overwhelming majority of the delegations.

When the American delegation managed to include in the summary report of the Conference a reference to its proposal, reiterating that the prohibition of nuclear tests is its "long-range goal", delegations of the non-aligned countries, following this assertion, wrote in the report that in their view such an approach ran counter to the opinion of the vast majority of states, which believed that the conclusion of a treaty with the aim of banning nuclear tests was the primary task, and that such a treaty

should be concluded immediately. The group of the socialist countries fully shared this opinion.

The Conference on Disarmament could do a great deal in bridling the nuclear arms race. The start of the Soviet-American talks on the entire range of problem would create favourable conditions for this. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries strictly adhere to the point of view that the Conference on Disarmament, where all five nuclear states are represented, is a proper forum for conducting comprehensive negotiations aimed at eliminating the nuclear menace. At the Conference they expressed the opinion that bilateral and multilateral negotiations should supplement and invigorate rather than exclude each other. The socialist countries believe that nuclear disarmament should, on a stage-by-stage basis and in compliance with the principle of equality and equal security, envisage a reduction of nuclear weapons down to their total elimination in all their modifications. In this context they stressed the need to prohibit neutron weapons. The socialist countries also advocated a quantitative and qualitative freeze on nuclear weapons, which would be a point of departure for reducing these weapons until they are completely eliminated.

In general, the socialist countries' stand was supported by the non-aligned, neutral countries. However, the USA and its NATO allies vigorously opposed the opening of negotiations on nuclear disarmament and the establishment of an appropriate auxiliary body of the Conference. The arguments advanced by the Western delegations that the nuclear disarmament problem "is not yet ripe for multilateral negotiations," that a freeze would bring "unilateral advantages" to the Soviet Union and similar assertions did not hold water.

The fallacy of these "arguments" was so obvious that non-aligned countries' delegations demanded that the provision be included in the Conference's final document to the effect that many delegations, having noted that some nuclear states had failed to produce convincing arguments in connection with their rejection of all proposals on a nuclear freeze, expressed regret over the rejection of the proposals on a nuclear freeze by some nuclear weapons states and their allies on the basis of artful and subjective notions about the parity of nuclear forces between major nuclear states.

The Session of the Conference convincingly demonstrated that the socialist and neutral, and the non-aligned countries are fully resolved to put an end to the arms race and, as a first step in this direction, to impose a general and complete ban on nuclear weapons tests. It was precisely from this position that the Conference appraised a new appeal of the heads of state and government of six countries—India, Sweden, Tanzania,

Greece, Mexico and Argentina—reminding the world on the eve of the Memory Day of Hiroshima victims of the need to achieve accords on the cessation of the nuclear arms race.

Such are the main results of the 1985 Session of the Conference on Disarmament. The results, which, if evaluated objectively and exactly, are incomparable with the major tasks and opportunities of this forum. This state of affairs possibly corresponds to the intentions of those who regard impeding the work of the Conference as an inalienable part of the efforts aimed at freezing the disarmament process, but the majority of the participating countries cannot be satisfied with this situation.

The Soviet Union readily supports negotiations on all agenda items of the Conference, that is businesslike and fruitful talks. There exists every prerequisite for overcoming the excessive stagnation, for accelerating the artificially decelerated progress, and for making a decisive shift forward.

One cannot but take into account that the factor of effectiveness and time is acquiring particular, unprecedented significance in every-day work and in the persistent efforts for the benefit of peace and disarmament. The results of the Session indicate that the participants in the Conference are beginning to realise the urgent need to move from words to deeds, from protracted and, not infrequently, academic discussions to the elaboration of practical accords on many issues ripe for a mutually acceptable solution. Today, the aim is to make this realisation the mainstream of the Geneva forum's activities.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1985

English Translation Progress Publishers 1985

/9317

CSO: 5200/1253

NUCLEAR TESTING-FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET JOURNAL ON IMPORTANCE OF NFZ IN SOUTH PACIFIC

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 12, Dec 85 pp 104-107

[Article by A. Kuznetsov: "A Nuclear-Free Zone in the South Pacific and Its Importance"]

[Text]

The 16th Session of the South Pacific Forum was held early this past August in the town of Avarua, the administrative centre of the Cook Islands. The leaders of the 13 states incorporated in this regional organisation unanimously adopted a decision to declare the South Pacific a nuclear-free zone. Under a treaty, Australia, New Zealand, the Cook Islands, Papua-New Guinea, Niue, Nauru, Kiribati, Tuvalu, Tonga, Vanuatu, Fiji, Western Samoa and the Solomon Islands pledged "for all time not to possess, use, test or deploy on their territory nuclear weapons". Also adopted at the meeting was a decision to impose a ban on the dumping of radioactive wastes into the ocean waters, inasmuch as the economies of many insular states depend on fishing.

The majority of the above countries, Australia and New Zealand included, immediately signed the treaty on the new nuclear-free zone. The delegations of the five remaining states will have to submit it to their governments for final endorsement. It is expected to be signed by all the states that took part in the Forum session by the end of the year.

The dimensions of the new nuclear-free zone being established by the Avarua treaty will be less only than that of the zone in Latin America established in 1967 under the Treaty of Tlatelolco (named after the Mexican city where it was signed). The southern border of this zone will pass on the level of 60 degrees south of the equator, and its northern boundary—along the Equator. In the east the zone will run along the border of the action of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, and in the west—pass between the territorial waters of Australia and Indonesia.

Also attached to the treaty is a protocol for ratification by interested countries which are not members of the Forum. This makes it possible, among other things, to spread its validity to New Caledonia, French Polynesia, the British Pitcairn Islands, which lie in the South Pacific, and islands and archipelagos under US trusteeship. The protocol to the treaty will be also sent for the subsequent ratification to the nuclear powers—Britain, China, France, the USA, and the USSR.

The importance of the document signed in Avarua for the peoples of this part of the world is beyond doubt. After all, it is in the Pacific Ocean, on Mururoa Atoll, that France still tests its latest atomic weaponry. The radioactive contamination of the environment caused by the more than 210 French and American atmospheric and underground nuclear

blasts in the Pacific Ocean has led to a large number of cancer cases and the appearance of children with birth defects and genetic anomalies.

The countries of the South Pacific are part of the catchment area of the US Seventh Fleet equipped with Trident submarines and Tomahawk cruise missiles with nuclear warheads. According to the assessment of the Pacific Ocean conference of churches, no less than 10,000 nuclear warheads have now been stockpiled or deployed on island bases and on ships and submarines in the Pacific Ocean.

The decision adopted at the Forum was a concrete embodiment of the antinuclear aspirations in the signatory countries. It reflects the growing concern of the peoples of the Pacific Ocean countries over the USA's militaristic course for a nuclear buildup in this part of the globe (naval air bases with nuclear ammunition delivery vehicles, arsenals of chemical and nuclear weapons, training centres for the Rapid Deployment Force, and radiocommunication tracking stations).

Also discussed at the Avarua Session was a proposal to deny ships and aircraft with nuclear power plants and nuclear weapons to the ports and airfields of the countries of the region. It was stressed during the debates that the main importance of this point of the treaty is not that there exists a danger of radioactive contamination (although, according to Pentagon statistics, some 40 cases of significant radiation leaks from US naval ships have been registered just lately). The main thing is that by allowing nuclear-capable ships and planes into their harbours and airports, these states can put their very existence in jeopardy.

However, through the efforts of the Australian Prime Minister, who, in effect, was pushing the Washington line at the Session, the proposal to include in the treaty a clause on a general ban on the calling at sea and air ports in the region of ships and aircraft with nuclear weapons on-board was rejected. Instead, it was stipulated that each country decide this issue on an individual basis. And this, of course, only weakened the efficacy of the treaty.

The results of the recent Session of the South Pacific Forum became possible solely thanks to the joint efforts of the majority of the countries of this organisation aimed at ensuring security, stability and peace in the region. The decisions adopted at it essentially supplement the initiatives of a number of the region's states on limiting nuclear activity in the South Pacific. Still long before the session Vanuatu and New Zealand had prohibited nuclear-powered ships or with nuclear weapons on board calling at their ports, and the Republic of Palau had adopted an anti-nuclear constitution formalising a refusal to provide its territory for the construction of a base for US atomic submarines.

The creation of still another (after Latin America and the Antarctic) nuclear-free zone attests to the fact that anti-nuclear sentiment, and above all the realisation of a real threat of a nuclear catastrophe, are engulfing ever wider circles of the world public, including regions of the globe comparatively far removed from the centres of world politics and the planet's "hot spots". At the same time, the Avarua treaty provides the prerequisites for easing the nuclear threat throughout the Asian-Pacific region. Its signing bespeaks the great potential of the antiwar, antinuclear movement in Asia and the Pacific region, and the considerable possibilities at the disposal of the developing countries in strengthening world peace and eliminating the danger of nuclear war. The Japanese *Tokyo Shimbun* is of the view that this step will stimulate the antinuclear movement throughout the world. The decisions of the Forum, stresses the Tokyo-based newspaper *Asahi*, will definitely have an impact on the creation of nuclear-free zones in Southeast Asia, the Balkans and elsewhere in the world.

A favourable factor for the conclusion of the treaty was the constructive stand of the USSR and other socialist countries of Asia, and a number of non-aligned states in favour of turning Asia and the Pacific basin into a zone of peace and good-neighbourliness, specifically, the proposals on the convocation of a pan-Asian forum, the elaboration of confidence-building measures in the Far East, the conclusion of a convention of non-aggression and non-use of force, and other initiatives. The Soviet Union, together with other socialist countries, is decidedly in favour of creating nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world, which would undoubtedly be an effective instrument in the effort to limit nuclear weapons and consolidate universal security.

The implementation of this idea is also furthered by the recent major peace initiatives of the Soviet Union, which, specifically, declared the unilateral cessation, effective August 6 of this year, of all nuclear explosions. The Soviet Union vigorously supports the striving of the peoples of the Pacific Ocean, as well as that of the other regions of the globe, without outside interference, to explore ways and take steps towards promoting detente and creating favourable conditions for solving the economic problems they face. As Mikhail Gorbachev stated in early August in his reply to a Message from the Japanese Council of Organisations of Victims of Atomic Bombings, "our country views with understanding the striving of many countries to create nuclear-free zones in various parts of the globe. We are for such zones being set up.... The efforts of South Pacific states aimed at creating a nuclear-free zone in that region are praiseworthy". According to local press reports, the participants in the Forum on the Cook Islands perceived these words by the Soviet leader with great satisfaction.

The creation of nuclear-free zones, like other possible measures to curb the race in the most dangerous types of armaments, is encountering vigorous opposition on the part of the aggressive imperialist circles, the United States first and foremost. This fully applies to the idea of proclaiming a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific. Washington has always been against the setting up of nuclear-free zones, calling the idea of proclaiming them "devoid of sense" and even "rubbish". William Bodde, the former US Ambassador to Fiji, stated that the movement for a nuclear-free Pacific Ocean was the most serious threat to American interests in the region. Right after the signing of the Avarua treaty, *The Washington Post* published a statement by a political observer close to the White House to the effect that the USA could not approve of this treaty since it might be used to impede its access to the Pacific Ocean. As the Japanese *Yomiuri Shimbun* believes, "it is difficult to expect Washington to be eager to ratify this document, which on the whole can impose certain restrictions on the actions of the US Navy in the region". Monroe Brown, the US Ambassador in Wellington, stated on behalf of the US Administration that he could not as yet predict what the consideration of that treaty's provisions would produce, and that in its reply the US side would take into consideration both the treaty's provisions and the overall strategic situation in which the treaty would be operative.

Other representatives of the US imperialist quarters spoke out more candidly: they demanded that the Administration step up military activity in the Pacific for ensuring the USA's "global interests". A special report, prepared under contract with the Heritage Foundation, which maintains close ties with the White House, stresses the importance of this region for the militarist programmes of the USA, including the notorious "star wars" programme. The document expresses serious concern over the Avarua treaty which, as the authors of the report state with alarm, pro-

hibits forever the deployment and testing of nuclear weapons in the region. In the light of these developments the "brain trust" of the Right is recommending that the Administration step up a campaign to brainwash the peoples of the region, using the "Soviet threat" myth to "neutralise" this treaty.

The Heritage Foundation proposes expanding aid to the Pacific countries which take pro-American stands as one of the means of attaining this goal. The Japanese press agency Kyodo Tsushin has reported that the USA, using its local agents in the countries that have yet to sign the treaty, has begun intensified indoctrination of statesmen there, impelling them not to sign the document endorsed on the Cook Islands. These at-

tempts were a failure, however. Under a provision of the treaty, it will enter into force when it is signed by nine of the thirteen states participating in the Forum. On September 16 of this year it was signed by the ninth state—Papua-New Guinea.

The French government made haste to state that it did not intend to reckon with that treaty and that the nuclear tests on the Mururoa Atoll would continue.

The negative stand of the United States on this issue is far from being accidental. It is a known fact that the South Pacific figures prominently in the global strategy of US imperialism. The USA views this region as a component of the ramified network of military bases being deployed in the Pacific basin and as one of its testing grounds for new types of nuclear weapons. It was on the US initiative that the ANZUS military bloc was set up. Continuing to step up an unprecedented arms race, the current US Administration is doing all in its power to involve other countries, including the South Pacific ones, in this dangerous, adventurist course. In a bid to justify its militaristic course and stifle antiwar, antinuclear sentiment, the US propaganda machinery is developing the tenet of the supposedly direct dependence of "prosperity and security" of the insular South Pacific states on American presence and the consolidation of the ANZUS bloc. Here Washington is trying to frighten the public of these countries with a "Soviet threat", the "aggressiveness of the Russians", and pious posturing regarding an alleged "beefing up of the Soviet Pacific fleet". At the same time, the USA is also intensively pushing its allies onto the path of militarisation. Washington is trying to turn the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) into a military bloc or at least to tether these countries separately to its aggressive designs. Frightening the peoples of the South Pacific basin with the mythical "communist threat", Washington would like constantly to hold a "nuclear club" over their head so as to facilitate the plundering of the natural resources of this vast region by American transnational corporations.

It is only natural that the rearmament, drastic beefing up and advanced deployment, close to Soviet borders, of the US Navy strike force have made the USSR take counter-measures to neutralise the attempts of the American military to attain military superiority over the USSR, specifically in the Pacific. However, what "Soviet aggressiveness" can one speak of when it was Moscow, not Washington, that pledged unilaterally, under any circumstances, not to be the first to use nuclear weapons; if the Soviet Union, and not the United States, has pledged not to use them

against countries on whose territory there are neither their own nor other's nuclear weapons?

Amidst the drastic worsening of the international situation, it is particularly important for all public and political forces to take energetic actions in support of the peace initiatives of the peoples of the Pacific basin, who have a vital interest in genuine security for this vast region.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1985
English Translation Progress Publishers 1985

/9317
CSO: 5200/1253

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET BOOK ON CONFRONTATION POLICY REVIEWED

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 12, Dec 85 pp 142-143

[Review by Yu. Chernyakov of book by B.I. Poklad, *Realities of the Modern World and the Policy of Confrontation*, Moscow, Mezhdunarodniye otnosheniya Publishers, 1985, 160 pp (in Russian).]

[Text]

This book analyses the key political, economic and military problems of modern international relations, complicated and contradictory as they are, and the approach of the USSR and the other socialist countries to their solution aimed at eliminating the threat of a nuclear war and strengthening world peace and security. The author lays special emphasis on the problem of confrontation between the two world social systems which, over the last years, has increased in all spheres due to the US and NATO militaristic course for upsetting the military-strategic balance, achieved in the late 1960s-early 1970s between the USSR and the USA and between the Warsaw Treaty and the North Atlantic bloc.

Speaking about the evolution of the NATO aggressive military doctrines based on the myth about a "growing Soviet military threat", the author emphasises the fact that they become more and more oriented at unleashing a nuclear war against the USSR and the other socialist countries and winning it. According to defence guidelines for 1984-1988 approved by Caspar Weinberger, the US Defense Secretary, the United States must win a victory in this war and get an opportunity to induce the Soviet Union seek its immediate end under conditions suiting the USA. For this purpose the USA must have at its disposal forces which, both during and after a protracted conflict, would preserve the

ability to destroy the industrial and economic facilities of the Soviet Union and its allies (p. 74).

Realising that, with the present correlation of forces, even a "limited" nuclear war would have catastrophic consequences for the USA as well, it is trying, on the one hand, to develop "more sophisticated" conventional armaments and doctrines of their use and, on the other, to carry the arms race into outer space, thus attaining superiority over the USSR and its allies. This is confirmed particularly by the strategy of the first strike deep into the enemy's territory ("air-land operation"), adopted by the NATO Council in December 1984 and the Presidential Strategic Defense Initiative ("star wars" programme) proposed in March 1983. Drawing extensively on facts to show how the US ruling circles are feverishly building up their military potential in order to achieve military superiority over the USSR, the author at the same time speaks about the consolidation of the forces of peace and socialism and their growing influence on the course of world development.

The book analyses the implementation of the Peace Programme adopted at the 24th CPSU Congress and developed at the 25th and the 26th CPSU Congresses. In recent years, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have repeatedly put forward proposals aimed at averting a nuclear war

and have been uncompromising in their efforts to carry them into life.

Thus, in 1981, the 36th Session of the UN General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Prevention of Nuclear Catastrophe and in June 1982, the USSR assumed a unilateral commitment not to use nuclear weapons first. This historic pledge was an important political action that evoked a broad response and support throughout the world.

The author points out that in subsequent years, the socialist countries made other proposals aimed at curbing the arms race, eliminating the war threat and consolidating peace were also widely supported. For example, Bulgaria initiated a campaign to collect signatures in support of measures to prevent a nuclear war, to limit the arms race and effect disarmament; Hungary made a proposal on non-deployment of nuclear weapons in the territories of states where there are no such weapons at present; the GDR proposed a ban on neutron and chemical weapons and suggested that the disarmament talks be invigorated; Mongolia proposed that the arms race in outer space be prevented; Poland proposed convening a world conference on disarmament; Vietnam suggested that a zone of peace and cooperation in Southeast Asia should be created, while Czechoslovakia proposed principles of international cooperation in the field of arms limitation and disarmament. Special importance is attached to the proposal of the socialist countries, stated in the Political Declaration adopted by the 1983 Prague Conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Member States, to conclude a treaty on the non-use of military force and the maintenance of relations of peace between two military groupings—the Warsaw Treaty and NATO.

With the aim of reducing and, eventually eliminating nuclear weapons and thus averting the threat of a nuclear catastrophe in general, the USSR proposed in June 1983 to the USA, Britain, France and China, as a first step in this direction, freezing the existing nuclear arsenals both qualitatively and quantitatively. In the same year, the UN General Assembly adopted the Soviet draft resolution on a nuclear arms freeze.

The author believes that although the USA has not so far supported either this or the subsequent proposals made by the USSR and other socialist countries and aimed at curbing the race in nuclear and conventional arms and reducing international tensions, there is no reason for pessimism. On the contrary this should give a new impetus to the struggle of progressive world forces against the nuclear threat. The unprecedented anti-war and anti-nuclear movement has involved millions of people in the USA, West European and other countries. The author goes on to say that "at times when a military threat was growing the masses became more active expressing their instinctive or conscious desire to prevent war, to protect people from ruin and devastation... in the nuclear age the masses' consciousness has reached a qualitatively new stage" (p. 7).

While focussing on measures to curb the arms race, B. Poklad also analyses the role of such important political factors as trade and economic relations, ideological struggle and the non-alignment movement.

The author points out that today when the USA and their allies adhere to a policy of confrontation with the USSR and the other socialist countries, the ideological struggle between the two systems, based on the issue of war and peace, is becoming the key problem of interstate relations. This is proved by the fact that, recently, the imperialist ruling circles have "renewed" their ideological arsenals. They have discarded the theories of "convergence" (gradual merger of capitalism and socialism) and of "deideologisation" of international relations, popular in the times of detente. Instead, they again have brought to the fore the myth about a "Soviet military threat", come out "in defence of human rights" allegedly violated in the socialist countries and accused them of "their involvement in international terrorism".

The "crusade" against socialism and genuine psychological warfare have become the culmination of this process of "reideologisation" of international relations. The author provides the latest data on the psychological warfare waged by imperialists against the countries of existing socialism, on the main

bodies involved in it, such as the US Information Agency's special "express information" department, on methods and forms of bourgeois slander and misinformation. "The entire course of world development deprives the proponents of capitalism of any prospects," says the author, "for the social system they support is outdated and irrational. The historical truth in the ideological struggle has been and remains with existing socialism" (p. 117).

In this book the author covers topical international problems, shows the real extent of nuclear danger threatening mankind and outlines ways to change the perilous course of events for the better.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1985

English Translation Progress Publishers 1985

/9317

CSO: 5200/1253

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

18 MARCH 86
